# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Vermont Yankee Power Uprate

**Public Meeting** 

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Vernon, Vermont

Date: Wednesday, March 31, 2004

Work Order No.: NRC-1401 Pages 1-124

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

## **ERRATA SHEET**

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has made the following corrections to the transcription provided by Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.:

- 1) On page 61, line 20, the speaker name was changed from "Mr. Ruland" to "Mr. Richards."
- On page 114, line 11, the speaker name was changed from "Mr. Ruland" to "Mr. Pelton."

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

#### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

CAT 3 PUBLIC MEETING

VERMONT YANKEE POWER UPRATE MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY,

MARCH 31, 2004

+ + + + +

VERNON, VERMONT

+ + + + +

The public meeting was held at the

Vernon Elementary School located at 381 Governor Hunt

Road in Vernon, Vermont, Bill Ruland presiding.

#### I-N-D-E-X

### <u>Speaker</u>

John Burke										15
David O'Brien .										22
Peggy Farabough										24
Sarah Edwards .										26
Peter Alexander										55
Peter Dizinski										60
Dan Jeffries .										63
Gary Sacks										64
Julie Enochs .										66
Julian Enochs										70
Edward Sprague										71
Jonathan Block										73
Phillip Riendeau	_									76
Meredith Blum										82
Ned Childs										83
Alan Steinberg										87
Andy Davis										92
Pamela Cabbage										96
Judy Davidson										99
Magdaline Bollit	us	;								102
Deb Katz										104
James Doyle .										106
Harold Bradeen										108
Sunny Miller .										109
Tim Stevenson										110
Nancy Burton .										112
Andrea Scheidle										116
Jeannette Peiffe	r				•		•			119
Fred Sprite .										120

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1 2 8:18 p.m. 3 CHAIRMAN RULAND: Good evening. Good 4 evening, and thank you for coming. I'm glad to see 5 that everybody's prepared for the meeting and brought fans, because we're all here in the room together. 6 7 Okay. MR. BIDWELL: Evidently, there's a Prius 8 hybrid with its lights on out in the parking lot. I 9 10 don't know if there's a bunch of people who drive 11 them. What was that license plate number again? 12 Sorry about that. PNORGUM. Okay. 13 CHAIRMAN RULAND: My name is Bill Ruland, 14 and I'm with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and 15 I'm the Manager in charge of the power uprate process at the NRC's headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. 16 17 We are holding this meeting at the request 18 of the Vermont Senators, Leahy and Jeffords. 19 (Applause.) 20 CHAIRMAN RULAND: You're going to need to 21 bear with us a little bit. As you know, the venue has 22 changed dramatically. It's obvious that you folks 23 want to talk about questions and answers, so we're 24 going to forego most of our prepared remarks and

presentation. I'm going to ask our staff to make some

1 key points, and we're going to move quickly into questions and answers. 2 3 However, before we start, I have some 4 introductions we need to make, and I'd like -- before 5 I do that, I'd like to introduce our facilitator who will help us with this meeting. 6 Mr. Bidwell, David Bidwell, go ahead. 7 Good evening, everybody. 8 MR. BIDWELL: 9 (Applause.) 10 I was laughing to someone MR. BIDWELL: 11 earlier if you know the classic chant of this is what 12 democracy looks like. I was saying in the room as hot it was getting in there, it was starting to be this is 13 14 what democracy smells like. 15 I want to thank everybody for coming out. I think this is absolutely fantastic -- huge turnout, 16 17 lots of people that are here. We know that there are 18 incredibly strong feelings about this issue, and it's my goal to help try to get those feelings and ideas 19 20 out going both directions and across the way to people 21 that are here. I have a few notes just to make sure 22 that I explain who I am and what's going on tonight. 23 Like I said, my name is David. I work for

company that does lots of different kinds of public

a company called the Perspectives Group.

24

involvement processes, and we are paid by NRC, I want to make that clear up-front, but I am paid to be a neutral, which is something that I take very seriously, okay? It's true. No, listen, I get paid to run advisory boards and things like that around the country, but I like to let people know who pays me because it's important to folks.

Just so folks know, there is a court reporter here tonight who is documenting the meeting. That's so that the NRC understands and remembers what everyone said, they can take it back. They also will make that transcript available publicly. An important thing for him that is really going to help is that before you speak you state your name very clearly, okay, and spell it for him. And I'll try to remember with my feeble mind to remind you to do that.

I think everyone knows this building better than I do, so I'm not going to tell you where the restrooms are; they're out in the hall. This is going to be a long meeting, okay? Please feel free to move around as you need. If you have kids, need to walk around, do that sort of thing, that's great.

And just to talk a little bit about my goal and what I'm tasked with tonight, okay? It is to try to make this the most productive conversation that

it can be. Now, what does productive mean? There are lots of definitions for that.

(Audience shouting.)

MR. BIDWELL: Hold on. Hold on. Okay? There are lots of definitions of that. What I want to try to do is allow NRC to talk about their process and what goes on but also for you all to provide the information to them. Just a few -- let me ask for some -- a few people here said, "Can you keep control of this?" My answer is, no. No one takes control of a meeting, okay? People decide to cooperate with a meeting. There will be lots of opportunities to talk. There is not going to be an opportunity for everyone to give a long speech, sort of like I'm doing now.

A couple of things that will help us get through tonight and then I'll move on and let them talk, and then we'll have a question and answer. One is please try to be as respectful as you can. That's not to say don't express yourself, please express yourself, but remember that there are diverse people in this room who have different objectives of being in this meeting, okay? So we want to try to allow an opportunity for as much dialogue as we can and have people get what they need to get out of this meeting. For some people, it's going to be getting up to date

on what the issue is; for some people, it's going to be stating their position.

In general, if you can, keep the chit-chat with your neighbors to a minimum. That is helpful. You are very large group, and if you have just a couple dozen people who are talking, it will really make it hard for other people to hear. That doesn't mean I don't want you to talk about things if you need to discuss it with someone. There are doors all around -- over here, here, here, here, here, here. Take a quick step outside the room and get your strategies in order.

(Audience member shouting.)

MR. BIDWELL: You're absolutely right, and if I can get through this real quick, we're going to move on. I am going to be going around as people raise hands with the microphone. To start with, I'm glad to give you the microphone. If folks start to take long, long speeches that are keeping other people from being able to talk, then I'm going to have to start holding the microphone for you, and I don't want to do that. I think you guys are a good group. I think you can do this, and I want it to happen. Excellent.

And unbelievable enough, that's all I had

to say. Thank you. I'm going to be walking around. Please if you have suggestions, whisper them in my ear, okay? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Thank you, David. I see some hands already raised. Okay. Like I said, give us just a few minutes to paint a picture about our process and our inspection program. We've already elected to not use our slides. I've asked my staff here to get five key points that they think that -- I've asked them on short notice to make some five key points about the areas they intended to cover so we can go quickly to questions and answers. I'd ask you to bear with us a little bit while we get this done, okay?

The primary reason we are here at the request of the Vermont Senators, okay, is to not only describe our process briefly but to also take questions and comments and concerns from the public. We're transcribing the meeting. Pete Holland here is our transcriber, so we'll be able to capture these comments. The NRC will consider every comment that we receive. At the end of this meeting, we will publish a meeting summary. The transcript will be part of that meeting summary, and we will also put a list of what the questions and the key issues that we believe

1	we've garnered from reading that transcript, and we're									
2	going to provide responses, and we're going to post									
3	that on our web site to give everybody an idea where									
4	we're headed.									
5	Before we start, I'd like to introduce a									
6	number of folks, particularly the federal, state and									
7	local officials who are in attendance today. First,									
8	from Senator Leahy's office, Mr. Chuck Ross. Chuck?									
9	(Applause.)									
LO	CHAIRMAN RULAND: From Senator Jefford's									
L1	office, Mr. Brian Keefe.									
L2	(Applause.)									
L3	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Any other federal									
L4	officials from any office? And as a matter of fact,									
L5	after I do these introductions, I'm going to give them									
L6	a chance to make a statement.									
L7	From the State of Vermont, I have Patty									
L8	O'Donnell, the State Representative from Vermont.									
L9	Patty?									
20	(Applause.)									
21	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Bill Sherman, the State									
22	Nuclear Engineer. Bill?									
23	(Applause.)									
24	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Bill? Bill, wave.									
25	Okay. There you are, Bill. Thank you. John Burke									

1	who is on the Public Service Board. Mr. Burke?									
2	(Applause.)									
3	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Several Town of Vernon									
4	selectmen, starting with the Chairman, Douglas									
5	Fletcher.									
6	(Applause.)									
7	CHAIRMAN RULAND: A selectmen, Peggy									
8	Farabaugh. Peggy?									
9	(Applause.)									
10	CHAIRMAN RULAND: And let's see, also Mr.									
11	Len Peduzzi. Len?									
12	(Applause.)									
13	CHAIRMAN RULAND: And before I get to ask									
14	them to make some initial statements before the									
15	meeting, let me introduce the NRC staff. Yes, sir?									
16	I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Any yes, sir.									
17	MR. BALES: (Off Mike) I'm Bart Bales.									
18	I'm here representing									
19	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Bart? And it's Bart is									
20	your name? I will also give you an opportunity. I									
21	apologize for not asking for any other state									
22	officials. Any other state officials? State									
23	Representative Sarah Edwards.									
24	(Applause.)									
25	CHAIRMAN RULAND: The State Senator									

1	Jeannette White.
2	(Applause.)
3	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Anybody else? Patty
4	O'Donnell, State Representative.
5	(Applause.)
6	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Does that sign say, "Get
7	on with it." I'm trying, sir. The NRC staff, we have
8	Stu Richards.
9	(Applause.)
10	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Stu has the Inspection
11	Program. He has the oversight for the Inspection
12	Program. We have Tony McMurtray.
13	(Applause.)
14	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Tony is our senior
15	engineer in charge of that helps me manage the
16	power uprate process. Rick Ennis who is the Senior
17	Project Manager for Vermont Yankee.
18	(Applause.)
19	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Some other staff, let's
20	see, Mr. Pelton, the senior resident.
21	(Applause.)
22	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Let me make sure I get
23	all these names right. We have Omar Patel, reactor
24	engineer.
25	(Applause.)

1 CHAIRMAN RULAND: Don Florick, Senior Project Engineer. 2 3 (Applause.) 4 CHAIRMAN RULAND: Brian Holian who spoke 5 a little -- did a great job at the first meeting. 6 (Applause.) 7 CHAIRMAN RULAND: And I think that covers the NRC staff. So I'd like now to give an opportunity 8 9 for the elected representatives or their staff to make 10 comments, starting with the Senators. So that would 11 be, let me get this right here, Senator Leahy's 12 representative, Mr. Chuck Ross. Do you choose to make 13 a statement? 14 MR. ROSS: Good evening. I'm Chuck Ross. 15 I'm the State Director for Senator Patrick Leahy, and I'd like to read a statement. 16 17 First, I want to thank the staff of the 18 Nuclear Regulatory Commission for coming to Vermont 19 and to Vernon tonight to meet with and hear directly 2.0 from Vermonters about Vermont Yankee's 21 application. On behalf of Senator Leahy, 22 appreciate the Commission's response to our request 23 for this meeting, and it's good to see so many 24 Vermonters here tonight in this strong showing of public interest in this very important issue. 25

Senator Leahy recognizes that Vermont Yankee is a significant component of our energy mix in Vermont. We are dependent upon its power, it service and its safety record. However, we need to be confident that the review of its power uprate addresses the concerns of Vermonters.

As you know, it has been perceived in Vermont that the NRC has already decided not to address the concerns raised by the Vermont Public Service Board. I was glad to see in the Rutland Herald today that you have not ruled us out. The Vermont congressional delegation sent a letter today to the Commission asking the NRC to address the Board's concerns. The members of the Vermont delegation believe you congressional have the authority to do this, and they urge you to address the Board's concerns as quickly as possible during your review.

The bottom line is that we want the NRC to do an analysis that will ensure that the plant is reliable and safe after the uprate. Irrespective of what you call the analysis, Vermonters need to be confident that the analysis is thorough and complete with respect to the issues of service and safety. It is the job of the NRC to explain, design and conduct

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the analysis that will allow Vermonters to have the confidence that a subsequent uprate at Vermont Yankee will be reliable and safe for the long term. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Mr. Brian Keefe from Senator Jefford's office.

MR. KEEFE: Thank you. My name is Brian Keefe. I'm with Senator Jefford's office. I'll be prompt. I'd first like to thank the NRC for coming here to hold this meeting. I'm sure you'll hear a lot of different views on the matter before us. Safety, of course, as Chuck just said, is of paramount concern to all of us here, including Senator Jeffords, Senator Leahy and Congressman Sanders who also signed the letter that went today.

As Ranking Member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator Jeffords has jurisdiction over the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, so we are watching this closely. We've been also in close contact, of course, with the Public Service Board and the Public Service Department. Once again, safety, reliability, these are the big issues before us today, and we look forward to a prompt response to the Public Service Board's concerns. Thank you.

(Applause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN RULAND: I know that John Burke from the Public Service Board would like to read a statement.

MR. BURKE: Thank you. My name is John Burke. I'm one of the three members of Vermont's Public Service Board. I'd like, if you would, after this meeting to deliver this letter as you return to Chairman Diaz and I'd read it to you and to the meeting now.

"Dear Chairman Diaz, we wrote to you on March 15, 2004 requesting that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission conduct its review of the proposed extended power uprate at Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in a way that will provide Vermont with a level of assurance about reliability equivalent to an independent engineering assessment. asked for this assessment because We of our significant concerns with the effect that the uprate may have on the future reliability of Vermont Yankee.

Today, the owner of Vermont Yankee Energy
Nuclear Vermont Yankee submitted a filing with the
Vermont Public Service Board that included a letter
from the NRC to Vermont Senator James M. Jeffords.
That letter from William D. Travers, Executive

Director for Operations, suggested that the NRC was planning to conduct a baseline inspection program for the power uprate rather than expanding the review.

It is unclear whether that letter to Senator Jeffords was intended to be the NRC's response to this Board. We have also received notice that the NRC will hold a meeting tonight in Vernon to discuss the power uprate with members of the public. At the present time, the Board has pending motions to reconsider our order approving the proposed power uprate.

#### (Applause.)

MR. BURKE: As a result, we cannot actively debate the issues raised in our order. However, we want to make very clear that the views expressed in our previous letter are unchanged, although we have not yet considered the pending motions for reconsideration one of which seeks a more extensive independent assessment.

#### (Applause.)

MR. BURKE: In particular, we reiterate our request that the NRC's review of the proposed power uprate include the following features. One, it would be independent in the same sense as the independent safety assessment of Maine Yankee, i.e. --

2.0

(Applause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BURKE: -- i.e. it should be performed by experts independent of any recent or significant regulatory oversight responsibility related to Vermont Yankee. Secondly, the assessment would be a vertical safety-related systems review of two maintenance rule non-safety systems affected by the The level of effort necessary for this work has been described to us in testimony as requiring about four experts for about four weeks. This will provide a valuable check on the reliability of the systems that are reviewed and allow for correction of any problems.

Third, the independent engineering assessment should be, as we believe it is expected, reviewed by the ACRS in the context of their evaluation of the power uprate.

We want to stress that our request is not based on a concern about the safety of Vermont Yankee. Safety is clearly an issue over which the NRC has jurisdiction and considerable expertise. Instead, our concern stems from the potential impact that the power uprate could have upon reliability, which would affect the value of Vermont to Vermont of existing purchase agreements for power from Vermont Yankee.

A number of nuclear plants have undergone extended power uprates and have experienced outages or power derates. The problems that led to these outages may not have been safety-related but they have affected the output of these nuclear plants. Our request is based upon our obligation to ensure that such outages are unlikely at Vermont Yankee.

Because of factors that are unique to Vermont Yankee, we also do not expect that granting our request will establish precedent. As we said in our previous letter, the record evidence we have heard shows that the proposed uprate at Vermont Yankee is larger than those that have occurred at most other nuclear plants, and, moreover, Vermont Yankee is one of the older nuclear facilities.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter. Sincerely Michael Dwarkin, Chairman, David Cohen, Board Member, and myself, John Burke, Board Member."

(Applause.)

MR. BIDWELL: I just want give folks a quick reminder too that people who have prepared letters or prepared statements are handing to the folks up here so they'll be able to make sure that they're word-for-word included in the transcript of

2.0

1	the meeting.
2	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Any other state or local
3	officials need to make a statement?
4	MR. BIDWELL: I believe there's a
5	gentleman over here.
6	MR. BALES: I'm Bart Bales. I am B-A-
7	L-E-S. I live in the town of Gill. I am here
8	Gill, Massachusetts. I'm here on behalf of actually
9	a number of elected officials who couldn't be here
10	tonight, and I have letters from each of them in this
11	envelope. And I wish to sort of give an overview of
12	what we're speaking to.
13	The first person that I want to speak for
14	is Massachusetts legislator Steven Kulik who
15	represents a nearby district to this area. He, as I
16	do personally, calls for an independent engineering
17	assessment of the type called for and detailed by the
18	Vermont State Senate resolution.
19	(Applause.)
20	MR. BALES: And such an assessment should
21	be of the level of the assessment given to Maine
22	Yankee in the past.
23	I also hold a letter from the Board of
24	Selectmen of the Town of Gill, Massachusetts also
25	calling for an independent safety assessment for the

Vermont Yankee plant. I can read these into the record. I also have them written. I'd like to read just the Steven Kulik one.

"I write regarding the proposed uprate of Entergy Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant that has been requested by its owners. As I understand the matter, Entergy has requested an uprate, which would bring its output capacity to 120 percent of the power it was originally designed for at the time of plant opening 31 years ago. Last week, the Vermont Public Service Board granted approval of that request successful completion contingent the of on an independent safety assessment.

I urge you to require that just such an assessment be completed before any further action on It is critical to the the uprate request is taken. health and safety of the population that an independent engineering assessment of all the plant systems at Vermont Yankee plant be completed in order to determine whether or not the systems are reliable or safe under the current standards before an uprate request is considered.

I represent the First Franklin District in Franklin County, Massachusetts, which borders Vernon, Vermont -- the Vernon, Vermont town where the plant is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

located. I strongly believe that this is a matter that greatly affects my constituency because of our close physical proximity to Vernon, regardless of the political boundaries that preclude any official role this office may play in the State of Vermont.

Clearly, the health and safety impact on my district would be substantial in the event of any accident, shutdown or other major event at the plant. The threat to our residents' physical well-being, job status and overall security is potentially very great.

I understand and was pleased to learn that my colleagues in the Vermont State Senate voted unanimously on a resolution to ask for an independent inspection with five criteria that are identical to the independent safety assessment performed in 1996 at the Maine Yankee at the request of then Governor Angus King. I strongly support their resolution that calls for an inspection that assesses the conformance of the facility" -- I'm going to give you the rest of this. It's the five points that the Vermont Senate called for identically.

"In light of the deep concerns about this matter shared by myself and my constituency, I strongly urge you to require that an independent assessment be completed in order to analyze whether

1	Vermont Yankee is in compliance with current
2	regulations, what the risks to the uprate system might
3	include and what the full range of safety issues are
4	currently as well as in the proposed capacity
5	increase. Thank you for your consideration of this
6	request."
7	(Applause.)
8	MR. BIDWELL: I'm sorry. Bill, could we
9	have just one more quick statement here?
10	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Sure. Go ahead.
11	MR. BIDWELL: If you could introduce
12	myself.
13	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. My name is David
14	O'Brien. I'm the Commissioner of the Department of
15	Public Service and also Chair of the Vermont State
16	Nuclear Advisory Panel. And I want to add our support
17	to essentially what Commissioner Burke just read from
18	the Public Service Board. Earlier today, in our
19	meeting, we resolved unanimously as a group to support
20	what the Board has asked for in their order to ask for
21	the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to do an independent
22	engineering assessment and to go further in their
23	review.
24	(Applause.)
25	MR. O'BRIEN: Now, I know this is safely

a divisive issue with respect to Vermont Yankee, but on this question of going the extra mile on a review seems to be something we all now have a consensus about, that our senators and our congressional leadership has spoken on this issue in support of the Public Service Board. The Public Service Board has spoken and you've heard from Commissioner Burke. The Vermont State Nuclear Advisory Panel today voted on this.

I think that, gentlemen, the NRC, with all due respect I think this is an opportunity for you to be a little flexible in your process, and I would expect that with your letter that you respond to the Board that we can look for something a little different than what we saw earlier this week. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. BIDWELL: All right. Thank you. Just a quick note in terms of process. I think it's great to support the ideas that you like. The longer the applause goes the less time it is for more people. I just want to make that an awareness. I'm not saying don't do it --

PARTICIPANT: People know that here. They know that. They live here. They speak regularly.

		MR.	BIDWELL:	Excellent
--	--	-----	----------	-----------

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. O'DONNELL: As a State Representative from this town, I think it's only fair that everyone's voice be heard. Now, I'd like it to be known strongly that although I haven't polled the Town the Vernon, I have heard from people in Guilford, and I support an independent assessment.

(Applause.)

MS. O'DONNELL: But I also want it to be known that this town strongly supports Vermont Yankee. They work here. You know, your voice can be heard when it's your turn. It's my turn now. We hear an awful lot about diversity and tolerance. there's more than one opinion here. And I also want it to be known that there aren't a whole lot of people from Vernon here, for one reason. Because for 30 years we've lived with this, and the Vermont way is not to be rude to people. The Vermont way is to listen to everyone's side, and I ask you, please, when you're in this town please be respectful of everyone's voice. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. FARABAUGH: Thank you. Peggy Farabough, F-A-R-A--B-A-U-G-H, Select person in Vernon. And thank you for giving me a chance to

speak. I do live in Vernon and I feel like you're trying to shut me out. We host this town. A lot of our neighbors and friends work for Vermont Yankee. It's an integral part of our town. We understand the safety issues at Vermont Yankee. We support Vermont Yankee very largely. Over 91 percent of the people polled in Vernon support Vermont Yankee.

I personally do not think that we need another independent safety assessment. The NRC conducts two. I don't think that's what this meeting is about. I think this meeting is about putting any kind of a roadblock in front of the progress of any kind of a nuclear power plant. And I think that you've chosen the wrong venue for that.

I feel I have -- I am a mother of two children who go to school here, I live here, my children go to school right across from the plant. I have confidence in the people who are operating the plant and in the NRC and in the record of the nuclear power industry over the last many years.

You don't see a lot of people from Vernon here, one, because they don't enjoy this type of entertainment. And if they want to know about the issues regarding nuclear power, they will do it in a more technical forum. The other reason you don't see

a lot of people from Vernon here is because when we stand up and try to speak, look at the way we get treated. There's not a lot of respect in this room. Patty was the first person who asked to get up and voice an opinion that was different from the mob's opinion, and look how you have treated her and how you've treated me.

So we do support Vermont Yankee, and I don't support the independent safety assessment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Yes, let her speak.

Hold on a second. Not everybody can speak all at once, and I know you folks want to ask us questions, okay. So how -- you want the Representative to speak?

Go ahead. Thank you.

MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. My name is Sarah Edwards, I'm a Representative from Brattleboro in the House. Sarah Edwards from Brattleboro. I'm a Representative in the House in Vermont. We have a resolution right now that I have 83 members have signed from the House from all parties of the 150 seats that are available in the House. And this resolution supports the ruling of the Public Service Board, and I wanted you all to know that there is an attempt to get the House backing to be on board with

all the other people who have spoken tonight with regard to the uprate and to the independent engineering assessment. And I'll be testifying on this tomorrow, and I hope that I can report back to you that we're in agreement with the Public Service Board and the Department of Public Service as well as our congressional delegation. Thank you.

(Applause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BIDWELL: Thank you all. What I want to do now is NRC would like to make a couple of points. They're key points about the assessment process and how that reflects what some of the other parties have requested. Then we want to move into the audience and make sure that you all have a chance to say why that is or is not adequate, what are the other points that you want to see and to express your views.

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Thank you. A number of representatives, public officials have talked about the independent safety assessment, and I see just a few signs of people urging support for an independent safety assessment.

As you know -- it does keep the place cool. As you know, the Senators Leahy and Jeffords -- we responded, the NRC responded to Senators Leahy and Jeffords in a recent letter, and we stated why the

Main Yankee independent safety assessment experience is not applicable to Vermont Yankee's power uprate application. The Senators' letters and the NRC's response mentioned the public request for Vermont Yankee to undergo the same type of ISA that was performed at Maine Yankee in 1966.

It is the NRC's position that the letter to the Senators does not represent the Agency's position on the Vermont Public Service Board's conditional approval of the Vermont Yankee uprate. does not represent. As you know, we also have a letter, as a matter of fact it was dated today, from Senators Jeffords Leahy basically, both and reiterating that the PSB has not received a written response from the NRC on its independent engineering assessment request, and they're requesting the NRC to letter Public Service issue to the Board expeditiously. The NRC staff will do that. So we are going to issue a response to the Public Service Board regarding their request. So we haven't done that, okay, but we will.

We've heard a lot of folks clamoring -that's probably the right word -- for an independent
safety assessment. We recognize that. At this stage,
our thinking is, okay, that, one, at this point that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the Agency's normal oversight and uprate review process we believe appears to provide information that coincides with the PSB's concerns. And let me list them a little bit.

NRC and independent contractors have inspected Vermont Yankee's design and licensing basis several times since Maine Yankee's ISA. Now, there's a lot of talk about what is an independent review. Well, first of all, the NRC is an independent regulatory agency established by Congress. Lochbaum, somebody that testified at the PSB from the Union of Concerned Scientists, argued that independent was folks that didn't have normal regulatory oversight of a plant. Well, the NRC performed such an It was called the architect engineer inspection. The NRC performed that inspection. inspection. was not performed by the local regional office, it was run from headquarters, it was run with contractors.

Those folks did not have routine regulatory oversight of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant, and if you actually looked at the independent safety assessment that you're clamoring for, the NRC ran that, a guy by the name of Ellis Merschoff ran that assessment. It was run with NRC folks, it was run with NRC contractors, and there were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

some state observers. But the independent safety assessment was run by the NRC. However, Mr. Merschoff did not report to the regional office, he reported to headquarters, he reported to the Chairman. And we've done that, okay? We have done an architect engineer inspection at Vermont Yankee, and the staff believes that not only have we done that, we continue to perform what we believe, I'm not asking you to believe it, what we believe are independent assessments of Vermont Yankee's engineering work. That's the first point I'd like to make.

The second point, the NRC does not issue decisions on the plant reliability specifically. However, plant reliability, we believe, is closely related to plant safety. It's not exactly the same but it's closely related. The NRC's power uprate process reviews the reliability of the modifications that the plant is performing and we consider that in our reliability review. So we do do a safety review and we examine reliability as part of that.

In August of this year, the NRC will conduct its every other year safety design inspection at Vermont requiring several inspectors to perform over 500 hours worth of direct inspections of 1 and 2 systems. Our power uprate review process, which we're

1 going to talk about briefly, that process examines equipment modifications and every system that is 2 important to the safety of a power uprate. 3 4 review covers both the actual safety systems and the 5 non-safety systems. any portion of these inspections 6 7 identify a problem, we go after it. Our inspection program, we believe, is robust and it's flexible. 8 We've shown the ability to respond to safety issues, 9 10 and I believe we're going to respond again. 11 So those are our thoughts right now. We 12 haven't responded yet to the Public Service Board, and 13 you have my commitment that we're going to do that. 14 Clearly, you folks are passionate about this issue, 15 and I feel that passion. Thank you. (Audience shouting.) 16 17 Again, let's afford the staff to make a 18 few key points. Tony McMurtray on power uprate 19 process. 20 (Audience shouting.) MR. BIDWELL: Let me step in, okay? Hold 21 22 Hold on. The NRC has come. They want to give on. 23 the points of what their process is, and then they 24 want to hear your reactions to that process. 25 (Audience shouting.)

1 MR. BIDWELL: Right now we're burning time, okay? 2 3 CHAIRMAN RULAND: We're going to be back, 4 okay? We are going to be back, we are going to have 5 another meeting further on the review process. have my promise on that, okay? 6 7 (Audience shouting.) 8 CHAIRMAN RULAND: We have not made up our mind. 9 10 MR. McMURTRAY: Good evening. My name's 11 Tony McMurtray. Bill introduced me. I work at NRC 12 headquarters. I just relocated to headquarters last 13 summer. Before that I spent nine years as a resident 14 inspector, approximately six years I was a senior 15 resident inspector at Peach Bottom, which is down in It's a similar vintage BWR. 16 Pennsylvania. 17 currently in the Division of Licensing Management at 18 headquarters, and I am in charge of the overview for 19 the power uprate process. 20 Some real quick points. Our power uprate 21 reviews are significant licensing actions and receive 22 a high amount of attention from the NRC Commission and 23 senior agency management. We now have a review 24 standard. This is our review standard. It took over

two years to develop this standard. This standard is

to guide the staff, utilities and public to the extent of our reviews. The plant owner must provide sufficient justification to the NRC that safety is maintained under power uprate conditions.

As Bill mentioned, the NRC staff reviews every system that is important to maintaining public health and safety that is impacted by the proposed power uprate. Vermont Yankee is the first plant requesting an extended power uprate that we are using this new review standard to guide the staff's NRC review.

And in closing, we believe that our power uprate process is a structured, robust, comprehensive process focused on safety and captures lessons learned from each uprate to improve later reviews. However, we welcome your comments on our review standard and our review process, and our web site is available in the handout, so please get them. We would have those on the slide. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Thank you, Tony. Stu Richards, you want to just briefly talk?

MR. RICHARDS: Very briefly, I'm Stu Richards, I'm from Washington and I'm responsible for the Inspection Program. A couple of points to make for tonight, we have a robust inspection program. I

1 think a couple of people have mentioned that before. We do inspect the engineering at Vermont Yankee and 2 all plants across the nation, and I think we do a 3 4 pretty robust job of doing that. And as part of the 5 power uprate process, there will be issues that come out of the technical reviews, and we'll factor those 6 7 into our Inspection Program. Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN RULAND: Thank you, Stu. And, 9 finally, Rick Ennis, our Senior Project Manager. He's 10 going to talk a little bit about the specific review 11 we're doing on Vermont. Rick? 12 MR. ENNIS: My name is Rick Ennis, and I'm 13 the Project Manager responsible for review of the 14 power uprate for Vermont Yankee at NRC headquarters in 15 I'm going to give you a quick status of Maryland. where we are in the review. 16 17 The forecast completion date of our review 18 is January 31, 2005 and that's documented in our 19 letter to Entergy, dated February 20. Although we're very early in the review stages, we've already 20 21 provided 60 technical questions to Entergy regarding 22 the specifics of the review, which Entergy has 23 responded to in a letter dated January 31 2004. 24 The next major milestone in the process

will be for the NRC to issue a Federal Register notice

to docket acceptance of the application for review. This notice will be posted on the NRC's web site. The Federal Register notice provides an opportunity for the public to request a hearing on the proposed amendment. And based on recent changes to the NRC's regulations, the hearing process now extends the period to request a hearing from 30 days to 60 days after the notice is issued. It's expected that this notice will be issued sometime in April.

The public may also provide comments to the NRC regarding the proposed amendment outside of the hearing process. The staff will consider those comments during the course of the review, and this meeting is one of the opportunities for you to provide comments to us.

There's many technical areas that we look as part of the power uprate process, and I just want to touch on two issues that are very high focus areas this time. Several plants have experienced dryer cracking following problems with steam implementation of a power uprate. Although the steam dryer performs a non-safety-related function, dryer must maintain its structural integrity to avoid loose parts from entering the reactor vessel or steam lines and adversely affecting plant operation. In

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

addition, there's also been other problems related to flow vibration issues that have caused damage to valves and pipe supports following a power uprate.

The steam dryer integrity and flow induced vibration issues are receiving a very high level of attention by the NRC and the nuclear industry, and these are probably the two biggest technical challenges associated with power uprates at this time.

Additional interaction between the NRC staff, Entergy and Entergy's contractor, General Electric, is expected on these issues. These interactions may include requests for additional information, on-site audits of General Electric and public meetings so that we receive information that demonstrates that safety will be maintained at the proposed uprate conditions.

As I mentioned earlier, I just want to emphasis that the NRC staff is in the very early stages of the technical review. Much more work still needs to be done before the NRC staff can come to any conclusions regarding acceptability of the Vermont Yankee request. This amendment will not be approved unless we are satisfied that safety will be assured. As Mr. Ruland mentioned, we will be back for another public meeting after we are further along in the

CHAIRMAN RULAND: 2 Thank you, Rick. 3 (Applause.) MR. BIDWELL: Finally, right, the moment 4 5 that you've been waiting for. Let me say just a couple more words, all right? One is please try to 6 7 keep your comments to the key point just so that as many people as possible get an opportunity to talk. 8 The school district has asked us to finish at 11, 9 10 okay? So that does leave -- you've got an hour and 50 11 minutes. The other thing is that when a question is 12 actually posed to NRC, I ask that you let them have a 13 couple of moments to try to answer that, all right? 14 The questions will be fielded by Bill, and if there is 15 a more appropriate staff person to comment on that, he'll ask them to say a couple of words, all right? 16 17 Many people have come up and asked me to 18 be first. I can't let 50 people go first, but I'm going to start over here and then when he's done I'll 19 20 be moving around through the room. 21 CHAIRMAN RULAND: Why don't you let Paul 22 talk first? Paul, want to talk? Okay. Fine. 23 you. 24 MR. GUNDERSON: My name is Arty Gunderson. I'm a teacher in Burlington of math. Prior to that I 25

technical review. Thank you.

had a bachelor's and master's degree in nuclear reactor operators license, and I was the Senior Vice President of a nuclear firm. I was the New England Coalition's expert witness during these hearings. In that capacity, I looked at over 100,000 documents. I'd like to share four pages with you tonight.

My review of non-proprietary emails and telecons provided by Entergy during the discovery process I discovered documents that seemed to indicate a disturbing pattern of collusion between Entergy, General Electric and the NRC. These same documents -- I'll be quick -- these same documents also appeared to demonstrate significant efforts by high levels of General Electric to intimidate the NRC into approving its generic safety uprate evaluation report. I've got the documents here. I will give them not to the NRC tonight but to our Congressmen. Let me continue.

I discovered emails and telephone notes from the NRC to Entergy where the NRC said that General Electric is licensing the project on the cheap. I discovered that General Electric -- that the NRC told Entergy that G.E., quote, "assumes the staff can reach conclusions on public safety without having adequate analysis." The documents also showed, more disturbing still, that NRC told Entergy that G.E. had

a piecemeal safety analysis. It gets worse.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The NRC then began to beg Entergy to quote, "have a heart to heart," with General Electric so that they could answer these technical questions. And, finally, the NRC told Entergy that G.E. wasn't being honest with them. Hello. You guys are the regulators, you guys are in charge. You don't have to whine to Entergy to get General Electric to do their job. It gets worse.

Entergy then told General Electric about this. Instead of addressing the NRC's technical General Electric dispatched concerns, its Vice President to go around the reviewers to their senior management. When that failed, the documents show that that Vice President went to the Commissioners, and --I can't believe this -- the General Electric VP let it be known that he was, quote, "going to go for their That's a curious use of words, and it iuqular." reflects a dangerous level of contempt and disdain by both General Electric and Entergy for the NRC's supposed regulatory role.

Despite not being honest, G.E. got what they asked for. To a former insider like me, it's no surprise that the NRC would cave to this type of industry pressure. It's via closed door meetings like

the ones indicated in these telecons, which I'll give to our Senators tonight, it's via closed door meetings that the NRC was persuaded by G.E. and Entergy to look the other way so that Entergy may avoid basic safety guidelines line net positive suction head. It's simple: The NRC agrees to look the other way, G.E. gets more business, Entergy gets more profits. You are not here to protect the public, you're here to protect the industry from the public.

(Applause.)

MR. GUNDERSON: I read another 99,996 pages, I'm unable to discuss them in two minutes, and, unfortunately, you'll never give me the opportunity to talk to you because you're not allowing Mr. Blanch and I into the process despite the fact that we've got 70 years of experience between us. We have never attempted to intimidate you, we've never attempted to go for your jugular. The NRC's outright rejection of our expertise forces us to go to Senator Jeffords and Senator Leahy with formal allegations based on this collusion which I've got the evidence for.

(Applause.)

MR. BIDWELL: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Let's talk a little bit about the NRC's allegation process.

2.0

1	(Audience shouting.)
2	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Well, let me respond.
3	MR. BIDWELL: Please let NRC respond, and
4	then we will move to the
5	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Let me respond.
6	(Audience shouting.)
7	MR. BIDWELL: Wait, wait, wait,
8	wait, wait.
9	PARTICIPANT: That was not a question.
10	That was not a question. Would you all agree that was
11	not a question?
12	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Paul, could you give
13	do me a favor, could you give the mike to Paul,
14	please?
15	MR. BLANCH: I'm Paul Blanch. Please give
16	Mr. Ruland a chance to respond in a calm manner. He
17	has a right to briefly respond to the questions.
18	Please respect Mr. Ruland.
19	CHAIRMAN RULAND: Thank you, Paul. Thank
20	you. First of all, this is not your mother's meeting.
21	I'm not sure this is the kind of meeting I thought
22	this was going to be before it started, but I
23	appreciate again, I just wanted to say I appreciate
24	the passion and the information we're getting.
25	The NRC is really here, because we're

recording it, to address these issues and to address them clearly, okay? That's why we're taking the notes here for this meeting. The NRC has two processes that we use to address the very kind of issue that we heard today. Frankly, I don't know the details behind this matter, but we're going to find out. The NRC has an allegation process that we go through. We examine what the allegation is, we go out and do inspections, and we try to get to the root of the problem and try to determine it and try to take some action. allegation against NRC staff and potential an wrongdoing, the NRC also has a process for that, and we have an independent Inspector General that we refer these things to. We do this frequently and all the It's part of the NRC culture, okay? And it's time. part of the NRC culture to examine these problems and look introspectively to try to understand what they Thank you. are.

MR. BLANCH: Thank you. My name is Paul Blanche. I have more than 35 years of nuclear experience. And just to carry on with what Bill said, I have a prepared statement. It's probably longer than I want to read and I'm going to shorten it down, but in response to the statement that Mr. Ruland just made, I've already contacted the Inspector General's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Office this afternoon and turned over these issues of wrongdoing. They're contained also in my statement, and I, again, want to allow other people time to express their concerns and issues, so I'm shortening up my presentation. I have given some of the copies to the NRC and also some of the media.

Mr. Gunderson and I actually support VY's current nuclear power output, and if the safety concerns of Vermont's residents and those surrounding states are examined and addressed, we may even support a power upgrade at Vermont Yankee. We both believe that nuclear plants can be operated safely but only if proper reviews are conducted to today's more stringent safety requirements and if complete evaluation of the risk associated with VY's regulatory non-compliances if conducted.

We could support the upgrade if, and only if, the NRC and Entergy are willing to talk about nuclear safety in an open, collaborative and candid manner with us and members of the public. Tonight is not the forum for that. I was extremely troubled when I learned that the NRC, Entergy and G.E. continue negotiating nuclear safety behind closed doors as documented by Entergy in its confidential and privileged documentation of phone conversations

between Entergy, the NRC, General Electric. General made veiled Electric even threats the Commissioners. Is this regulatory agency that we rely on to assess nuclear safety when the nuclear industry have free access to the Commissioners and influence Commissioners with t.he threats and intimidation? Is intimidation part of the NRC's regulatory process?

A few year ago Mr. Gunderson were invited by the government of the Czech Republic to review safety issues for two proposed nuclear power plants. This former Soviet state facilitated public dialogue with us in open and cordial meetings. These open forums included utility, the media, SUJB, which is the NRC equivalent, and the general public. We were even provided tours of all the nuclear facilities in order for us to more fully examine public questions and thoroughly address safety concerns.

Contrast as positive with the opposition contempt and disdain we have received in the U.S. from both Entergy and the NRC. We have raised significant safety issues related to Vermont Yankee. Mr. Chairman, raised them four months ago. No response. The immediate response by VY was to hold a press conference by invitation only within the plant fence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for the sole purpose of personally discrediting, demeaning and slandering me. To that end, Entergy attempted to discredit my nuclear experience, diminish my educational background and imply that I was unfamiliar with NRC regulations. I'm going to shorten this up now because I'm taking too much time.

In my concluding statement, I just want to say that those of us involved with the technical expertise and the willingness to speak out will be involved in the safe resolution of these issues and will continue to make our voices public no matter how often you attempt to silence us. The choice is up to Entergy and the NRC, that choice being one of collaboration or a continued adversarial relationship. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Thank you, Paul. Paul and I go way back. What is it the '80s, Paul? Personally, from what I have observed in the NRC, what I heard tonight is foreign. I have not seen this behavior, okay, so this is new to me. It's something that the NRC is going to treat seriously. I personally don't think I have ever tried to silence our critics. Our critics are important to me. It is what helps us make us better.

I've talked to Paul on many occasions,
I've talked to David Lochbaum, and sometimes what they
tell us it's not nice and it's not easy to hear, but
we do that, and I personally have done that. It's
something we've got to take to heart. It's one of the
lessons I think that the NRC tries to learn and
continues to learn about listening to our critics. I
think we're going to continue to do that. So next
person. Mr. Bidwell?

MR. BIDWELL: We're going back here to the

MR. BIDWELL: We're going back here to the bleachers.

MR. DOUD: My name is Louise Doud. That's spelled D-O-U-D, not D-O-W-D, please, D-O-U-D. I live in Warwick, Massachusetts. I've come with some friends and we left many people at home because we had a cherished member of our community die yesterday and many people are not here because they're at his calling hours.

I want to say something about process before I ask my very brief question, which I then like to be able to respond to after I get an answer to it, which is that I think it's quite understandable the energy in this room and the outbursts since it after nine o'clock when significant openness about having members of the audience make comments finally was

2.0

reached. And I want to give you that observation. I
don't many people in this room have distinguished
between the first hearing and the second hearing.
People came because they were interested in finding
out what is happening and to express their opinion,
and the signs and the short responses are what most of
us have had up until now. It is now 25 after nine and
the meeting started at seven.
So I'd love to talk to you, Mr.
Facilitator because I have a number of having done
facilitation work in my own life, I have a number of
suggestions. I will get on with it. My question is
what was the original design life of this nuclear
reactor across the road? And then I would like to be
able to ask a question after I get an answer to that.
CHAIRMAN RULAND: The original licensed
life of the plant was 40 years.
MR. DOUD: It was designed for 40 years.
CHAIRMAN RULAND: That's correct.
MR. DOUD: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RULAND: No, no. That's the
licensed life of the plant.
MR. DOUD: That would be the longest
design life I've heard about in the early reactors.
Can you get a more specific answer on that?

MR. RICHARDS: Just briefly, the plant was
licensed for 40 years. We have a process by which
plants that can demonstrate it appropriate they can
renew their license for up to 20 years. The design of
each of the components is based on the original
engineering that went into that component, so you
can't say the plant was designed for 40 years. We
licensed it for 40 years.
MR. DOUD: You licensed it for 40 years
based on design criteria that would say that each
component would last at least 40 years?
MR. RICHARDS: No. We licensed the plant
for 40 years based on initial submittal of their
licensing request recognizing that over that 40-year
period of time there would be a large number of
inspections that the utility would do, that we would
do, that there would be inspections, maintenance,
replacement of components. So it's not the
expectation that you build a plant and then it lasts
as built for 40 years.
CHAIRMAN RULAND: You had a follow-up
question?
MR. DOUD: It's not a just that 32
years is awfully close to that, and I'm really
wondering how we can imagine a safe the continued

safe operation with an uprate happening at the same time.

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Т understand. Essentially, the question is how can this plant last much longer than 32 years? The NRC's requirements that the licensee must comply with requires them to do surveillance testing, requires them to do in-service inspection of all the important safety-related equipment. Licensees, as a result of that, in Vermont Yankee replace equipment if they don't meet our requirements. We don't permit licensees to operate their plant without meeting those requirements that are in place for them.

This Licensee, as part of their power uprate, is replacing a number of components. The plant has feedwater heaters that heat the water prior to going into the reactor. Essentially, all of those have been replaced. A number of safety pumps will be replaced, okay? So there is a number of processes that the NRC has in place to make sure that the plant's equipment operates appropriately. Mr. Bidwell.

MR. BIDWELL: Thank you. Let me just -- one more little thing, okay? This is -- wait. This is not a hearing. It's an opportunity to have an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

actual answer from NRC, and that's what we're trying to provide an opportunity for.

MR. SHADIS: Thank you. I quarantee to make this brief. I have to disagree with you, Stu, with respect to the design life of the plant. Documents surrendered to us in this process before the Vermont Public Service Board after two orders compelling Vermont Yankee to hand over the documents reveal that, yes, they believe they have a 40-year design life, and those particular documents were signed by Jay Thayer, the CNO here.

So, no, they believe they have a 40-year design life, and in fact, as you know, the principal components of this plant, which will never be replaced, such as the reactor vessel, are designed for a limited number of thermal cycles. And when you put an equation to it, it turns out to be 40 years. What is going on now is an attempt to pencil away all of those original limitations.

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Mr. Shadis mentioned the reactor vessel. The NRC has specific requirements and a specific rule that requires those reactor vessels to meet to make sure that they're safe. Those requirements apply to Vermont Yankee, and the instant the Licensee doesn't meet those requirements the plant

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

will be shut down. Mr. Bidwell, where are you? Hello?

MR. BLAZEY: I'm Colin Blazey. I'm from Windham, Vermont. I lived in Brookline, Vermont when the plant was built. My neighbor died building the plant. And the whole key issue that I don't understand in this whole uprate question is in terms of being civil, how can it be civil to continue to make more non-disposable nuclear waste? If you can't answer that simple question, what are you going to do with the waste, nothing that you can say technically can even possibly hold a candle to that major safety question.

(Applause.)

MR. BIDWELL: Does the NRC have a comment?

CHAIRMAN RULAND: Yes, I do. Thank you.

The Licensee right now stores their fuel in the spent fuel pool. It's safe in the spent fuel pool. Okay?

It's safe in the spent fuel pool. The Licensee, if they run out of capacity in that spent fuel pool, they will not be able to operate the plant any longer if they've run out of capacity. What they would need to do is apply for a license or either take -- do that or a general license to get dry cask storage. And we've given a general license for dry cask storage. We

believe that's safe. We've licensed those casks. They're extremely robust devices. And I think those licenses go on for, what, 20 years? A 20-year license for those dry cask storage. I'm confident that that's a safe alternative.

And the Department of Energy right now, as you know, is preparing to do a submittal for the Yucca Mountain storage, so the Department of Energy is preparing the submittal, and when that submittal comes in, the NRC will review it. Mr. Bidwell, where are you?

MR. BIDWELL: I'm over here.

MR. FELDMAN: My name is Ira Feldman. I'm an emergency room doctor for Cooley Dickinson Hospital in Northampton, Massachusetts. That's about 35 miles from here and well within the zone that would be contaminated if you have a major reactor accident at this plant. I want you to know my hospital has worked very hard to look at disaster preparation and my emergency room cannot deal with the casualties that would be produced by an accident at this plant, nor can the emergency room at Greenfield or the emergency room in Keene or the emergency room in Brattleboro.

In the medical profession, we have a guiding principle of first do no harm, which means

that before you expose the population to a technology you're obliged to prove that it's safe. I think that's a principle that ought to be applied in this situation as well. This reactor isn't safe, it's very dangerous. Ever since September 11 we have understood clearly that our nuclear power reactors are, in a sense, weapons of mass destruction which we have built and sited around our country and left there waiting for terrorists to activate, and it is time for us to understand that.

If we found a group of Islamic fundamentalists out in the woods building something like Vermont Yankee, we would think we had stumbled the mother of all al-Qaida plots and we would arrest them as terrorists and throw them in jail. But a nuclear power company gets to build these kinds of reactors, and now Entergy wants to make this plant even more dangerous by upgrading its production beyond what it was supposed to tolerate.

The very least that we can ask is that there be a complete safety (Applause.) before this happens. There should not be an upgrade here. This plant should not be upgraded. It shouldn't be allowed to operate. It should be shutdown, and we should focus all of our energy on making the containment as

1 secure as we can around the huge pile of spent fuel rods that have already been generated so that those 2 3 can't become a weapon in the hands of terrorists as 4 well. And I think it's time for the Nuclear 5 Regulatory Commission to meet its responsibilities to 6 7 protect the public, not to protect the industry it's 8 supposed to regulate. Thank you. 9 (Applause.) MR. FELDMAN: Just one thing I wanted to 10 11 That's a comment, not a question, and I would say: 12 prefer if you didn't answer so that other people have 13 a chance to talk. Thank you. 14 MR. BIDWELL: I think that it behooves us 15 to have an opportunity for NRC to lay out its side of the story as well. This is an opportunity -- it is an 16 17 opportunity. Bill, would you like to respond? Very 18 briefly, please. 19 CHAIRMAN RULAND: Brian, go ahead. 20 MR. KEEFE: No, just briefly, some people 21 might not be aware of answers in that vein. Post 9/11 22 the agency has gotten hundreds of questions about 23 security of the plants, not just what they've done 24 historically when we licensed them, but in the post

9/11 environment, how can you continue to maintain

1 that the plants are safe? We have received those questions. 2 was a fax sheet that probably just 100 or 150 were 3 4 available here on security, post 9/11 security orders 5 that have been performed by the NRC. Briefly, that's available there, and it's 6 7 available on the Website. The NRC has done a top to bottom security review and looked at vulnerability 8 9 assessments for some of the very similar issues that 10 he's raised. 11 The NRC has the ability to issue orders. 12 done issues -- we've issued orders have 13 overtime, on access authorization and other issues. 14 The NRC has the ability should they see 15 vulnerabilities to issue upgrades. So that is something that at the Commission is being reviewed, 16 17 and there is more information on that. 18 MR. BIDWELL: Okay. We're going to move 19 up here. 20 MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. My name is 21 Peter Alexander. I'm the Executive Director of the 22 New England Coalition. 23 (Applause.) 24 MR. ALEXANDER: First, I want to thank you folks for coming out and giving a message to these 25

folks that they can take back to Washington. We want an independent safety assessment.

(Applause.)

MR. ALEXANDER: I also want to thank Senator McDonald for introducing Senate Resolution S.R. 21 and having the courage to steer it through and the political savvy to steer it through and to the Senate who voted unanimously for independent they call it engineering assessment, but it's a safety assessment, and it is the criteria outlined in that resolution which we believe will inform a proper job so that we can feel that the plant has been carefully and properly examined.

I want to read into the record the editorial that Raymond Shadis and I wrote, and it was published in today's <u>Brattleboro Reformer</u>. I think it says very well a lot more than what I can say in a few minutes that are given to me here.

I want to just say my message to you is real simple. We're not deceived. We will not accept anything less than a full, independent safety assessment at Vermont Yankee. We're not fooled by Entergy's tricks, and we're not fooled by the NRC's misrepresentations about your extended power uprate review process.

Your agency left the staff of our congressional delegation with the misapprehension that your uprate review process was informed by and, therefore, by inference, was as good the independent safety assessment conducted at Maine Yankee in 1996. That's clear. I mean, it's clearly spelled out in Jeffords' letter and Leahy's letter that that was the misapprehension they were left with after talking with your staff.

This misapprehension was memorialized in that letter to Chairman Nils Diaz. The very afternoon that the letter was written it found its way into the hands of Entergy, which lost no time in using it to try to deceive the Public Service Board and the Vermont legislature into thinking that the extended power uprate review process was the same as or as good as an independent safety assessment.

From that point on Entergy's spokespeople even co-opted the term "independent safety assessment," stating publicly and in the media that the NRC's extended power uprate review process constituted not one, but two independent safety assessments.

I'll just be another minute, David.

I want to say, David, you're a really nice

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	guy, but I think you're a really lousy facilitator.
2	I'm sorry.
3	(Applause.)
4	MR. ALEXANDER: Fortunately, the Vermont
5	State Senate was not fooled by the letter or by
6	Entergy's lobbyists. Jerry Morris, who used it to try
7	to convince the legislature that an ISA was not
8	needed, the Senate voted unanimously to pass their
9	request for an independent engineering assessment, and
10	they defined it properly.
11	I think there are many people here tonight
12	from several states around the region who resent the
13	fact that Entergy and the NRC have been playing word
14	games with us.
15	(Applause.)
16	MR. ALEXANDER: And I'll just say that's
17	a very nice way to put it.
18	If you want to establish even a semblance
19	of public trust, then come clean on this devious
20	deception. Hold your staff and Entergy Corporation
21	publicly accountable for misleading the Senate staff,
22	the Public Service Board, the state legislature, the
23	people of Vermont, and all of New England.
24	Finally, I want to let you know that as
25	far as the New England Coalition is concerned, this

1 process is just starting. We have dedicated ourselves to preventing this uprate, and we are confident that 2 when an independent safety assessment is conducted at 3 4 Vermont Yankee, that plant will fail miserably. 5 If you want to convince us otherwise, then give us the real thing. We want an independent safety 6 7 assessment. 8 Thank you. 9 (Applause.) 10 You know, the reason we're MR. RULAND: 11 here is to try to explain what we're doing and to take 12 your comments, digest them, take them back with us, 13 and that's what we're going to do. 14 I object to any accusation about the NRC 15 misrepresenting to Congress. I was part of those phone calls. I talked personally. Okay? We did not 16 17 misrepresent anything to the Senate staff, and we just 18 didn't do that. Okay? So let's just let -- I think you want to 19 20 make some comments. I'd like to just go ahead, and 21 rather than respond individually to particular 22 comments, I'd just like to go ahead, and if we could, 23 everybody just get a couple of minutes, make a 24 comment, and for at least about the next half hour or

so, let's just have some comments.

1	Mr. Bidwell, are you there?
2	MR. BIDWELL: We'll see if folks have
3	specific questions that they want a response from you.
4	They should indicate that as well.
5	MR. RULAND: Okay. Thank you.
6	MR. DIZINSKI: My name is Peter Dizinski.
7	I'm from the Town of Leyden, representing the Planning
8	Board for the Town of Leyden.
9	We're well within the ten mile radius of
10	this plant in the neighboring State of Massachusetts,
11	and we have very little say in the internal affairs of
12	the State of Vermont, but we are very concerned
13	because of the dangers that this potential uprate
14	poses to our community.
15	Number one, I'm very concerned as to why
16	the corporation at this time is asking for and this
17	I want an answer to an uprate on an aging plant.
18	Is it purely for the profit motive? Is that what's
19	behind it?
20	I can't understand how you can ask an old
21	plant to put out more than it was designed to in the
22	first place. I certainly can't run as fast as I used
23	to, and I don't think any of you can.
24	The point of the matter is that as a
25	neighboring community, we have part-time police, part-

1 time fire department, part-time personnel in all of our offices that have to do with the public safety, 2 3 and there is no way that we can be warned in time of 4 any kind of catastrophe. 5 of us work in the fields of agriculture or in the woods. Far and away, we have no 6 7 sirens in our town. We have the monitors that are at our homes, but we're not always there. Our police 8 9 work in other towns far away. Who are we to rely on 10 if this uprate goes through and this thing melts down? 11 Thank you. 12 (Applause.) 13 MR. RICHARDS: Just a quick response. 14 You said you asked a question why did the company ask 15 for an uprate. We as the NRC can't tell you why the company asked for it. 16 Our purpose is to -- our 17 purpose is --18 (Participant speaking from an unmicked location.) 19 MR. RICHARDS: First of all, we'll not 20 21 speculate on the company's motives. Our purpose is to 22 take their amendment and to take a look at it from an 23 engineering point of view and decide on whether the 24 plant can be safely operated at the uprated power

condition.

1 With regard to emergency planning, if that's an issue, that should be addressed as part of 2 the review standard that goes along with the uprate. 3 4 It will be looked at. 5 MR. RULAND: Thank you, Stu. One other comment on that. 6 MR. HOLIAN: 7 Plants, they had some slides from the NRC about power uprates. Some plants applied after a couple of years 8 9 for power uprate. Margins of safety were built into 10 original design aspects of the plan. Over the years 11 they have not only changed power uprates at different 12 They've also changed some of the technical levels. 13 specifications that they operate by, allow the NRC 14 staff to review those. The inspectors from the region 15 go out and change on those changes. So it's not only power uprates. 16 17 certain margins of safety, certain equipment 18 allowances for taking things out of service. still have technical specifications that they have to 19 20 follow. If equipment is out of service, the plant 21 still shuts down when those design margins cannot be 22 met. 23 That's all. 24 MR. RULAND: And if they don't make the 25 standards, they don't get the power uprate.

1	Mr. Bidwell, where are you?
2	MR. JEFFRIES: Right over here.
3	MR. RULAND: Question right here. Okay.
4	Go ahead.
5	MR. JEFFRIES: My name is Dan Jeffries.
6	First of all, I would like to thank the
7	NRC for coming to town with such excellent
8	representation.
9	Second of all, I'd like to bring to your
10	attention, considering the representation that is in
11	this room tonight, that a vote was held in this region
12	two years ago on whether Vermont Yankee should
13	continue to operate or not, and a majority of the
14	people in the region voted in favor of the continued
15	operation of Vermont Yankee. I think that's
16	important.
17	And the other thing I would point out is
18	that as a taxpayer, I expect that the Nuclear
19	Regulatory Commission will conduct business in
20	accordance with its regulations, its rules, and its
21	guidelines, and as has been stated in this room, it
22	should not be intimidated by the people here or any
23	other business or corporation.
24	MR. RULAND: Did you get his name? We got
25	Dan. Okay. Thanks.

1	Somebody else? Mr. Bidwell, where are
2	you?
3	MR. BIDWELL: Over here.
4	MR. RULAND: I think he's a pretty good
5	facilitator.
6	PARTICIPANT: Three minutes, five seconds.
7	MR. RULAND: I disagree with you.
8	Go ahead.
9	MR. SACKS: Thank you.
10	My name is Gary Sacks, Brattleboro,
11	Vermont. I am not a nuclear engineer.
12	NRC, I do not trust you to protect the
13	safety of the state nor to be honest in your dealings
14	with the residents of Vermont.
15	NRC, I do not trust you nor Entergy to
16	call this machine across the street safe without an in
17	depth inspection like was done at Maine Yankee in
18	1996.
19	You said Three Mile Island was a wake-up
20	call for the industry. That was March 28th, 1979, the
21	same year the NRC publicly stated there's no such
22	thing as a safe amount of radiation.
23	Since 1979, these are some of the events
24	that have occurred:
25	February 11th, '81, TVA's Sequoia I plant

1 in Tennessee, a rookie operator caused a 110,000 gallon radioactive coolant release. 2 3 January 25th, '82, Ginna plant nearly 4 Rochester, a steam generator pipe broke, 15,000 5 gallons of radioactive coolant spilled, and small amounts of radioactive steam escaped into the air. 6 7 January 15th and 16th, Brown's Station, nearly 208,000 gallons 8 of low level radioactive contaminated water accidentally dumped 9 10 into the Tennessee River. 11 '81, '82, and '83, Salem I and II. Shall 12 I go into all of them? 1996, Chairman 13 Shirley Jackson, 14 Chairman Shirley Jackson speaking of Milstone in Time 15 Magazine, "clearly, NRC dropped the ball. We won't do it again." 16 17 February 15th, 2000, New York's Indian Point II, an aging steam generator ruptured, venting 18 19 radioactive steam. The NRC initially reported no radioactive material was released, but later changed 20 21 their report to say there was a release, but not 22 enough to threaten public safety. 23 Wait. Didn't the NRC in 1979 say there's 24 no such thing as a safe amount of radiation? 2004, the new NRC Chairman, Nils Diaz, on 25

1 Davis-Besse said the agency "dropped the ball." Again? Dropping the ball is not okay. If Three Mile 2 3 Island was a wake-up call, were you asleep at the 4 control panel during these other events or just 5 napping? The NRC fallbacks of defense in depth, 6 7 redundant safety systems, alphabet soup acronyms, and color candy coated labeling systems do not help me 8 feel more safe. 9 10 Entergy refuses to have public dialogues 11 with a local community to address safety issues, 12 saying the NRC process is where public concerns are to be addressed. How does it serve the NRC's Public 13 14 Affairs Office to refuse to hold independent 15 assessments that have been requested? At this point the entire state is lining up in that direction. 16 17 (Applause.) He says the question is 18 MR. BIDWELL: 19 rhetorical. I had someone that needed to leave because 20 of a small child and I have lost her now. 21 Oh, 22 standing right in front of me. 23 MS. ENOCHS: Hi. My name is Amy. I live 24 in Brattleboro. This is my son Julian. He is almost 25 five years old. Enochs, E-n-o-c-h-s.

1	I have a question that I would like
2	answered by the NRC, and my son is here tonight
3	because he has an idea, and I would like to help
4	support him in that.
5	Hold on. Let me ask my question.
6	My question is it is correct that there
7	have been eight uprates in the United States. Is that
8	the correct number?
9	MR. McMURTRAY: There have been 101
10	uprates granted.
11	MS. ENOCHS: One hundred and one uprates.
12	And how many plants are experiencing uprated related
13	difficulties right now? Four; is that correct? There
14	are four plants that are experiencing difficulties.
15	So my question is if these difficulties
16	MR. RULAND: Steam dryer issues. I think
17	you're referring to
18	MS. ENOCHS: Okay. They are uprate
19	related difficulties.
20	MR. RULAND: Right. Plants that are
21	actually plants that similar in design to Vermont
22	Yankee, yes.
23	MS. ENOCHS: Yes.
24	MR. RULAND: Quad Cities Units I and II.
25	MS. ENOCHS: Yes, and the Dresden plant.

1	MR. RULAND: Quad Cities Units I and II
2	and the Dresden plant, yes, correct.
3	MS. ENOCHS: So my question is: why is
4	the NRC even considering more uprate applications
5	instead of looking into these four plants that are
6	experiencing uprate related difficulties?
7	MR. RULAND: Great question. Thank you.
8	(Applause.)
9	MS. ENOCHS: And then my son would like
10	to. My son has a comment.
11	MR. RULAND: Can I answer your question
12	first?
13	MS. ENOCHS: Yes. I would like an answer
14	to my question.
15	MR. RULAND: Okay. Thank you.
16	MS. ENOCHS: Thank you.
17	MR. RULAND: What you mentioned about Quad
18	Cities concerns the NRC. It turns out I'm the project
19	director for a project director at three which has
20	oversight of the licensing of Region III plants out
21	there in the Midwest, and Quad Cities and Dresden are
22	in the region that I have licensing responsibility
23	for.
24	Virtually as we speak well, they've
25	probably gone home virtually as we speak, the NRC

is in discussion with Exelon about these very matters, and we're seriously considering taking additional regulatory action. We haven't yet. We are considering it. Any of the lessons learned from those from Quad Cities will be applied to the review of Vermont Yankee.

As I've stated before, we haven't approved the Vermont Yankee uprate. If we have a problem with the steam dryer at Vermont Yankee than hasn't been adequately resolved to our satisfaction, we won't approve it.

So Quad Cities, maybe in the next week or so, if you watch our Website or give us a call, we'll let you know what we do. Okay? But it would be premature for now for us. We're having internal NRC discussions about this matter, but we are going to take some action on this.

We already had taken action. The licensee had sent us a letter agreeing that they wouldn't raise power above the former 100 percent power for a significant amount of their operating cycle. That's what they did. They did that at our insistence. Okay?

And we're going to insist that they address that issue.

1	MR. HOLIAN: Bill just to add directly to
2	that question, I did attend the VSNAP meeting this
3	afternoon from, I guess, 3:30 to 6:00 or so, and I
4	just wanted the other public to know in case VSNAP
5	doesn't get a chance to be mentioned again, this is
6	one of the questions that they've raised and other
7	people have raised on the issue, is the dryer issue.
8	It has been raised in letters to the NRC,
9	but it has been raised in that vein. It was some of
10	the questions that went back on the time line that you
11	didn't have. Some of you might have the slide from
12	the time line and why the VY application wasn't
13	accepted originally and why there were additional
14	questions asked. The dryers were a part of that.
15	MR. RULAND: And, by the way, it is
16	included. Vibration is included in our review
17	standard regarding the steam dryers.
18	MS. ENOCHS: Okay. I would a young
19	citizen, I would like to give Julian the time that he
20	has waited so patiently here for tonight.
21	Do you want to tell them your idea, honey?
22	MR. ENOCHS: No.
23	MS. ENOCHS: So Julian is here tonight
24	because he had an idea of issuing tickets to the
25	people who are creating the pollution at the factory

1	across the street. In our home we call it a
2	"factory," and so Julian made a bunch of tickets, and
3	the idea behind the tickets is that the tickets will
4	cost Entergy so much money that they will not have
5	enough money to keep that factory open.
6	(Applause.)
7	MR. ENOCHS: And they can one listen.
8	They can you could pay one maybe, but then the
9	others you can't pay because you have to use all the
10	money to pay one.
11	MS. ENOCHS: So I
12	(Applause.)
13	MR. RULAND: Sounds like an expensive
14	MS. ENOCHS: So I had thought that there
15	would be Entergy officials up here this evening, but
16	maybe you gentlemen could pass the tickets on to the
17	Entergy officials.
18	(Applause.)
19	MR. BIDWELL: Are you going to give them
20	the tickets? Okay. I think he's having some
21	difficulty relinquishing the tickets.
22	(Laughter.)
23	MR. BIDWELL: All right. I'm going to go
24	ahead and move on here to this gentleman in the front.
25	Then I'm going to swing around this direction.

MR. SPRAGUE: Thank you.

My name is Edward Sprague, S-p-r-a-g-u-e. I'm a resident of the town. I live just down the road here with property bounded on two sides by Vermont Yankee.

## Is this coming through?

As a resident, I've had to kind of resolve in my own mind what am I living in the midst of, and I was there when this -- I came to this place in the present house in 1955. It was a dairy farm when I moved in, and then Vermont Yankee came in in about 1967-68.

I had my fears and trepidations, and I did some studying, and I had my own monitor checking on radiation and all of this sort of thing. I finally resolved in my own mind I'm living next to something that is really quite safe.

And somebody raised a question: what does the company want out of this thing? Obviously it wants profit, but more particularly, we are in need of more power. Every one of you buy electrical appliances. You bring them on line. You don't even think about where the electricity is coming from, and you'd be very upset if it was turned off.

Anyway, my next thing. In my own mind,

73 this operation is a very simple process. You're going to put more water through the reactor to make more You aren't changing the temperature or the pressures within the reactor. It goes on and goes through a more efficient equipment to make more electricity with less steam input, and the end result is a 20 percent increase in power. It makes a lot of sense, and it has nothing to do with the age of the equipment. As long as that reactor is sound and you can put more water through it, and all you're doing is burning a little You're putting a little more -- what? more fuel. All you're doing is adding a little more fuel to it to heat that additional water, and I don't see that that's any great shake. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BLOCK: Jonathan Block.

Many of you know that I've been dealing with these issues for the past 11 years, and it's very difficult to sit here all of this time listening to the NRC's comment about the availability of a public hearing while I'm the attorney that's involved in taking them to the United States Court of Appeals in the First Circuit suing them over the fact that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 they've just implemented new rules under which the hearing that they'll offer you will be called 2 3 "informal." 4 You'll have no right to present witnesses. 5 You'll have no right to present evidence. You'll have no right to cross examine witnesses. This is their 6 7 idea of due process. It's very similar to the idea of due process that they had in Italy and in Germany in 8 9 the 1930s. I suggest that we need to do something 10 11 about this; that this is just the beginning. You have 12 This is only the tip of the iceberg. to wake up. Today's New York Times had an article 13 14 about the licensing of new nuclear power plants. This 15 is all part of a push by the Nuclear Energy Institute and the nuclear industry. They know this is their 16 17 last chance, and if people in this country don't wake up, and I mean wake up and stand up now, there's going 18 19 to be nuclear power plants all over this country. 20 And when it comes time to go to the 21 licensing hearings, you'll have absolutely 22 opportunity to do anything but stand there and wail. 23 (Applause.) 24 MR. BIDWELL: Just, Bill, a quick check on 25 whether that's a correct assessment of that hearing

Τ	process.
2	MR. RULAND: I'm not a lawyer. I don't
3	I don't want to talk right now about the hearing
4	process. You can go to our Website, check it out.
5	Okay? You can listen to the comments previously made
6	by the current by the previous speaker.
7	What I'd like to say has to do about the
8	safety of the plant and the comment process. The NRC,
9	okay, it's common practice for us to address and
LO	consider every comment on the licensing action and
L1	we're going to do that. Okay? It's an informal
L2	process. It's not the formal hearing process, but it
L3	is an informal process.
L4	I have a commitment from my staff to
L5	address those technical concerns. If Mr. Blanch gives
L6	us those technical concerns or Mr. Shadis, the more
L7	specific the better. We will address those.
L8	Thank you.
L9	And I resent any, any comparison of the
20	NRC to some nefarious regime. I think that's
21	completely that is completely out of bounds.
22	Thank you.
23	(Applause.)
24	MS. COOPER: My name is Martha Cooper, C-
25	O-O-D-e-r I'm from New Hampshire

Keene is the largest city in New Hampshire that's close to the plant. He says, "As Mayor of the largest and closest city in New Hampshire to Vermont Yankee,
and closest city in New Hampshire to Vermont Vankee
and crobebe crey in New Hampbhile to vermone rankee,
Vernon, Vermont, I humbly request that an independent
safety assessment be undertaken at Vermont Yankee
prior to permitting the 20 percent increase in energy
producing capacity.
"I have recently toured Vermont Yankee,
and I am very impressed with its security, its
personnel, and the condition of the facility. My
reason for requesting an evaluation of the plant is to
assure all that Vermont Yankee is capable of safely
increasing its production by 20 percent.
"Mayor Michael Blastos."
Thank you.
(Applause.)
(Applause.)  MR. BIDWELL: And just to clarify, that
MR. BIDWELL: And just to clarify, that
MR. BIDWELL: And just to clarify, that was an independent safety assessment, correct?
MR. BIDWELL: And just to clarify, that was an independent safety assessment, correct?  Okay.
MR. BIDWELL: And just to clarify, that was an independent safety assessment, correct?  Okay.  MR. RULAND: You'll give us the letter?
MR. BIDWELL: And just to clarify, that was an independent safety assessment, correct?  Okay.  MR. RULAND: You'll give us the letter?  Thank you.

Now, my interest in this here is this meeting was called for people representing from the State of Vermont. The legislature of the State of Vermont asked the NRC to come and actually hold this meeting.

One thing that I noticed that's missing though is that you've got neighboring states from Massachusetts and New Hampshire who have not actually been invited these meetings, to you know, specifically. There are maybe members here representing you, but there are not representation for these states who border this nuclear plant.

I also think that in regards to like Mr. Alexander's comment about word games, that "uprate" to means sounds like something that you would do like increasing the price of your electricity. It's almost accepted to the public, especially the public that's not paying attention to this whole process, that calling this an "uprate" to me is just a wrong word. I mean, this is a power increase, and if you worded it in this manner, more people would probably be here than already were.

My question to the NRC about this: your process here seems to be almost like a double standard to me. Okay? We as the public, when we work, we go

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 to our employers, and we're told, you know, that we have to submit to like drug tests, for instance, and 2 3 it's for the good of the company, and you know, we're 4 expected as law abiding citizens to say that if you're 5 not doing anything wrong, why worry. you're saying 6 Well, that you're 7 independent assessor. Well, what is wrong with you allowing an independent assessor, independent of the 8 NRC to look at this? 9 10 (Applause.) 11 MR. BIDWELL: Would you like him to 12 respond to that? 13 RIENDEAU: Yes, I would like a MR. 14 response to that. 15 MR. BIDWELL: He asked for a response to that, to a response to that, to the independent's 16 17 question. 18 As I said earlier, when the MR. RULAND: 19 when the Maine Yankee independent 20 assessment was performed, it was performed by NRC 21 people. Okay? It was performed with contractors that 22 worked for the NRC. There were some state observers. 23 Okay? That's the inspection that was performed, and 24 we believe that we performed, while not nearly as

extensive, we performed an independent assessment

using the architect-engineer inspections. It didn't report to the region. It was with contractors that worked for the NRC.

Okay. Now, if you remember, we've gotten this letter from the Senators from Vermont asking us to exercise our authority. What I said at the beginning of this meeting was we take this seriously, and we're going to evaluate this, and that's all I can tell you.

MR. HOLIAN: Just to add on on the word game issues or questions, it's not our intent. We're responding to things. We know the Vermont Yankee folks and people that are interested are fully aware of the Maine Yankee ISA, the independent safety assessment. So we've been responding to those.

Earlier today I did rush through those slides. It has not been mentioned yet, but we have inspections that are done very two years, safety system design inspections. There is one coming up in August. It has already been discussed by both Mr. Shadis and Mr. Blanch at the PSB hearings, and they're looking at issues like that.

We do look at two systems every year on safety related systems. The only other item I wanted to get across that we didn't fully get across earlier

1 is throughout this year on these baseline inspections the region can focus all of its inspections or all of 2 3 the related inspections onto power uprate aspects. 4 So quite a few of our normal inspections 5 will pick modifications that are done or systems and look at them on what they're doing with the power 6 7 uprate or power increase. So I just wanted to make 8 that clear. MR. McMURTRAY: Just one minor correction. 9 10 Our SSDI inspections or our safety system inspections 11 that Brian mentioned, we do those every other year as 12 part of our process, not every year. 13 MR. RULAND: Thank you. 14 BIDWELL: Has a quick follow-up 15 comment or question. 16 MR. RULAND: Okay. 17 MR. RIENDEAU: Yeah, once again, you know, 18 you're really not answering the question because 19 you're saying that you as a the NRC are doing the 2.0 independent inspection. What is wrong with allowing 21 an independent agency picked by the State of Vermont, 22 State of New Hampshire and the State 23 Massachusetts combined to go in and do this kind of 24 thina? I believe there has got to be engineers, 25

1 you know, that work in the nuclear industry that are not working for the NRC at this time. 2 3 MR. RULAND: As I previously stated, we 4 are going to respond to the PSB for that request, and 5 we haven't written that answer. It's going to be at a higher pay grade than Bill Ruland. You know, we're 6 7 going to talk about this, and we're going to consider 8 it. That's all I can tell you. 9 (Applause.) MR. BIDWELL: Bill, Bill, he also asked if 10 11 you could follow the participation of up on 12 neighboring states and what NRC thinks about that. 13 RULAND: I talked to our public MR. 14 affairs quy, Neil Sheehan, who is back there, and I 15 don't think I introduced Neil when we did the introductions. 16 17 Neil tells me we put advertisements in the 18 local papers. It was open for anybody that read those 19 advertisements. It wasn't limited to people in the State of Vermont. 2.0 21 Neil, maybe you could tell me where we 22 placed those advertisements. I don't know, but we did 23 try to get the word out, and I know the E-mail 24 underground probably helped. Neil, have you got any

suggestions about answer to the question?

1	MR. SHEEHAN: Certainly. We put out a
2	press release. We let all of the local media know.
3	Certainly there were articles that ran in area papers
4	letting people know. The public is always invited to
5	attend.
6	MR. BIDWELL: He's talking about reaching
7	out to I believe, sir, you're talking about
8	reaching out to
9	MR. RULAND: This is a good question. We
10	got it on the record. We'll respond to this question
11	as part of our as part of the meeting summary, and
12	we'll provide you an answer. Okay?
13	MR. BIDWELL: I think that he's
14	MR. RULAND: It doesn't sound like we have
15	the full picture right now.
16	MR. BIDWELL: I believe that means "we
17	need to look into that." Is that right, Bill? That
18	means we need to look into that?
19	MR. RULAND: Yes, yes, exactly.
20	MR. BIDWELL: Because we don't know right
21	now.
22	MR. RULAND: Thank you. Yes, we will look
23	into that.
24	MS. BLUM: My name is Meredith Blum, B-l-
25	u-m.

And I would just like to take a quick moment to formally present to you 411 signatures from people that couldn't be here tonight because of work or family reasons. The petition basically says that "we, the undersigned, demand an independent engineering assessment be performed on the Vermont Yankee nuclear power plant. We also demand that the independent inspection will be in compliance with the Vermont State Senate Resolution SR-21."

(Applause.)

MR. CHILDS: Okay. Thank you.

My name is Ned Childs. I live in Dummerston, Vermont, just about exactly ten miles.

I first want to say in response to R&E and which the G.E. revelations Ι think require congressional investigation, full blown, I know the man who founded General Electric, the first president and chairman for over 30 years, Charles Albert Coffin. He was referred to in a Fortune Magazine article as the number one CEO of all time. About 1890 to 1925, he ran the company. He was a Quaker from Maine. grew up poor, and he said he got into electricity as a successful businessman in his 40s and led the company through its dark days to greatness because he thought electricity could be a wonderful thing. Ιt

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would be every man's slave.

2.0

I have often those Charles Albert Coffin, my great grandfather, would be amazed to see what it has become, that we have become slaves to electricity, but at his death, he was credited with being the man who more than anyone else put electricity over.

And he ran G.E., and I think he would be shocked and horrified.

Now to my point. In today's <u>Brattleboro</u>

<u>Reformer</u> I hold here -- and I'll go quickly. This

will go quick -- Vermont Yankee spokesman, Brian

Cosgrove, if he's still here -- he was right over

there -- my good friend, not colleague, is quoted. He

says, "Maine Yankee was a plant that had a lot of

problems, while Vermont Yankee is a nuclear plant that

has always had a reputation for being well run and

well maintained." Brian suggested it's apples and

oranges.

Well, in fact, Mr. Cosgrove has misspoken. He has dissembled. He has, in fact, lied to us.

The fact is that in 1995, the last year before Maine Yankee was outed by a truly independent assessment run by the NRC, but under a Democrat in the White House, which that assessment resulted in an NRC official saying it would be insanity to ever restart

1 that plant; Maine Yankee achieved a higher SALP score, systematic assessment of licensee performance, than 2 3 Vermont Yankee in 1995. It was two twos and two ones 4 to Vermont Yankee's three twos and one one. 5 Go figure. Brian, you should have checked your facts. Brian, come back over from the dark side. 6 7 (Laughter.) MR. CHILDS: Today, March 31st, 2004, it's 8 9 the 25th anniversary of Day Five at Three Mile Island, the day they figured out that the hydrogen gas bubble 10 11 in the melted down core at the one year old Unit II 12 reactor would not blow the vessel and containment resulting in a Chernobyl scale disaster in the heart 13 14 of Amish country; the day they figured out that 15 controlled releases would save the day, and local and national cancer mortality rates began to soar. 16 17 There never has been an honest analysis -this is the end -- of the morbidity in the known plumb 18 19 This was covered up, and the NRC, you guys, 20 were then and are still complicit in this coverup. 21 By the way, last night we also learned the 22 still molten core at the destroyed TMI Unit II reactor 23 could go critical at any time. The China Syndrome is 24 still distinct possibility at Harrisburg,

Pennsylvania, Peggy and Patty, wherever you are.

Now, this is the end.

Admiral Hyman Rickover, we also learned, the progenitor of the United States Nuclear Navy, pressured then President Carter, a nuclear engineer himself, to downplay the disaster. Rickover's daughter signed an affidavit that her father made a deathbed confession to her -- that's dead man's testimony, not admissible in court -- that he had last regretted his actions which he feared would have devastated the commercial nuclear power industry and even potentially the nuclear Navy he so dearly loved.

Finally, last night we also learned that one research epidemiologist who worked the numbers

one research epidemiologist who worked the numbers around TMI honestly and earnestly ascertained abnormal clusters of metastatic breast cancers around nuclear communities, including Hanford, Washington, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Vernon, Vermont, and so on.

I do not see that adult female mammary glands are well represented tonight in either the NRC group or the Entergy group. Why is that?

(Applause.)

MR. CHILDS: I'm almost done.

Maybe these guys were bottle fed from birth. Now, listen, good people here. Go do a Google

1 search on New England Coalition, Google search on New England Coalition, three words, and support the ant 2 3 people in our fight against the Godzilla, this uprate, 4 this Vermont Yankee, this travesty in a high tech 5 disguise. 6 (Applause.) 7 MR. BIDWELL: No response needed. 8 MR. STEINBERG: I'm Alan Steinberg. Ι 9 live in Putney, Vermont and work in Brattleboro. 10 And following up on what Ned said about 11 CEOs, I'd like to just briefly read you a very short 12 story that I think will illuminate the situation 13 somewhat more. 14 A man I know finds himself in a meeting 15 room at the very edge of speech. He's approaching his moment of reckoning, and he is looking for support 16 17 from his fellow executives around the table. 18 Strangely, at this moment no one will look 19 The CEO is pacing up and down on the slate 20 gray carpet. He has asked in no uncertain terms for 21 their opinion of the plan he wants to put through. 22 want to know what you all think about this, " he 23 demands, "on a scale of one to ten." 24 The CEO is testy. He makes it plain he

wants everyone to say ten, and damn whether they mean

it or not. He's just plain tired after all of this 1 time of people resisting his ideas on the matter. 2 3 glares at them. He wants compliance. 4 My friend thinks the plan is terrible and 5 that there is too much riding on this solitary ego. Everyone in the company will lose by it. He is sure 6 also from the talk he has heard that half the other 7 executives in the room think so, too. 8 As they go around the shamed faced table, 9 10 the voices of those present sound alternatively 11 overconfident or brittle and edgy. Most say ten. One 12 courageous soul braves a nine and a half. 13 And my friend is the last to go. 14 reaches his hand toward the flame, opens his palm 15 against the heat, and suddenly falters. Against everything he believes, he hears a mouse-like far away 16 17 voice, his own, saying, "Ten." 18 Now, this story was not my own. It comes from David White, a writer who has been working in 19 20 corporate America for years to try to humanize the 21 corporate world. 22 And I tell you this story not because I 23 think it typifies what I see at Entergy, although I 24 believe it does. I tell it because you folks here in

this room sitting in front of me probably feel it in

1 your gut as well. We know it, and I think you know it 2 as well. 3 You think this group is scary. We know 4 you have to go home to Washington, and we want to say to you that any substitute, robust proposal that is 5 anything less than a full form, vertical slice, 6 7 independent assessment as far as we're concerned is a 8 zero. 9 (Applause.) 10 MR. STEINBERG: And, you know, I do have 11 some sympathy for your position. I realize, like I 12 said, we're not as scary as what you need to go home to. You need to face your CEO, who needs to face his 13 14 CEO, who ultimately faces a big CEO who we all know is 15 the President of the U.S.A., whose position on nuclear 16 power has been made abundantly clear. 17 So we invite you to go home and take the 18 opportunity and not offer us nine and a halfs and tens, but go home and hold your heads high, and say 19 20 that the people here want this assessment, and that 21 that's what you feel needs to happen as well. 22 That's what you need to be able to do to 23 sleep at night. 24 Thank you. 25 (Applause.)

1	MR. BIDWELL: I am told I have a yes or no
2	question over here.
3	MR. DAVIS: I'd like to ask a question and
4	then make a comment.
5	My name is Andy Davis. I live in
6	Brattleboro.
7	Has any uprate related work already been
8	undertaken at Vermont Yankee, yes or no?
9	I can't hear you.
10	MR. RULAND: You're discussing physical
11	modifications?
12	MR. DAVIS: Has work related to the uprate
13	begun at Vermont Yankee?
14	MR. RULAND: That's physical
15	modifications, engineering work?
16	MR. DAVIS: Has work related to the
17	uprate I'm just asking a question. I'm not a
18	nuclear engineer.
19	MR. RULAND: Let me try to answer that
20	question. Engineering work has begun. The licensee
21	has done engineering work. The outage hasn't started.
22	I don't personally know if any modifications have
23	made. My presumption would be that the work would not
24	actually physically begin until this outage, which is
25	getting ready to start.

1 Dave Pelton, you know the answer to this question? 2 MR. PELTON: I don't pretend to speak for 3 4 the licensee, but I know as the senior resident 5 inspector that the licensee had put aside work, specific changes to the plant, that were related to 6 7 power uprate pending the state's approval of that. I do know that for a fact. 8 MR. DAVIS: I've read in the Brattleboro 9 10 Reformer that work is going on related to the plant. 11 The problem is one where you gentlemen 12 have confidence. It's easy to characterize people who 13 speak out and interrupt as somehow irrational. 14 been following this issue in New England for over 20 15 I've been to meetings about increasing the years. amount of waste stored on the site. I've been told 16 17 that at this meeting certain things cannot be talked 18 They have to wait for this meeting. about. The frustration in this room is a result 19 20 of the process. It's not the result of people being irrational or angry. This process has led to this 21 22 frustration. 23 I'm a reasonable person. I have to get up 24 at eight o'clock in the morning. I have to be at work I've waited a long time to ask a 25 tomorrow morning.

1	simple question.
2	I don't trust this process. They're
3	already working on this. That's the perception on the
4	street in Brattleboro.
5	One other thing. This meeting could not
6	have been designed to deepen the suspicions of
7	reasonable middle-of-the-road people like myself any
8	more than it has, and I'd like to know the name of the
9	gentleman who introduced himself from Washington, D.C.
10	in the dark blue suit. Your name?
11	MR. RICHARDS: I'm Stu Richards.
12	MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
13	When you say that you cannot speculate on
14	why Vermont Entergy is asking for this uprate, it
15	makes me inside really suspicious, and that's just
16	being honest to you man to man. That's the low point
17	of the meeting to me.
18	You must know the motivation for this.
19	Why won't you tell it? What is the motivation for
20	this, sir?
21	MR. RICHARDS: I'll tell you again.
22	MR. DAVIS: One hundred, over 100 of these
23	have happened. What's the motivation?
24	MR. RICHARDS: Can I answer the question,
25	please?

1 Again, I don't speak for the company. We work for a regulatory agency. If a power 2 wants to come in --3 You need to move the 4 MR. BIDWELL: 5 microphone closer to your mouth. MR. RICHARDS: Yeah. If a power company 6 7 comes in and asks for an amendment to their license, our job is not to engage in why they want to do a 8 9 power uprate, why they want to make the change, as 10 long as they address the safety aspects. 11 And I keep coming back to that because we 12 are not a power regulatory agency. We are not in the 13 business of trying to decide whether the State of 14 Vermont needs power or not or how that power is going 15 to be generated, whether it be from goal, from dams, from solar wind. Our job is if somebody wants to 16 17 operate a nuclear power plant, that it be done safely, 18 and that's our sole focus, and I will not speculate on 19 why people make power decisions that are outside of 2.0 our area of expertise. 21 MR. RULAND: You discussed -- let me try 22 to address your question. Let me try to address your 23 question. The NRC has not -- we haven't approved the 24 power uprate in spite of any amount of modifications

that the company chooses to take at their own risk, we

don't -- we would not and cannot and will not -permit them to exceed their current thermal license
power level, period.

Whether they're doing modifications in anticipation or not is not the NRC's regulatory purview. If those modifications don't affect the safety of the plant at its current licensed thermal power, okay, we don't have an issue with that.

Now, let me address the other piece about what the company chooses to do. Most companies choose it because they're making money. Okay? That's plain and simple.

What I think Stu's point is trying to say, that we try to exercise a certain mental discipline on ourselves to say that our focus is safety. And I apologize for our staff if in any way we're communicating unresponsiveness because I know Stu is not trying to be unresponsive.

But we always try to focus on safety, and by asking a question as you did, which is a legitimate question -- and, frankly, it's a question for the company -- it, frankly, goes against our grain to talk about this because this is not our job. Our job is health and safety of the public for the use of nuclear materials. That's it.

1	MR. HOLIAN: And, Bill, just to add on,
2	the modifications that are planning to be made during
3	this outage we briefly spoke to before, you know, they
4	won't be used for the power uprate until that's
5	approved by NRC headquarters.
6	However no, however, I just wanted
7	to no, he mentioned that it's yeah.
8	MR. RULAND: Absolutely, positively, no.
9	MR. HOLIAN: No, that's clearly at the
10	risk of the licensee. That's clearly at the risk of
11	the licensee.
12	I did just want to make a point though.
13	They can make a mistake during those modifications.
14	They can replace the same pump with an identical pump,
15	and still put the impeller in backwards. They can
16	those things happen.
17	Our NRC inspectors will be monitoring
18	those modifications. I wanted to get that across.
19	MR. McMURTRAY: Let me give you one other
20	quick example. In the power uprate application,
21	Vermont Yankee has said they're going to need three
22	reactor feed pumps, which they now only operate two.
23	They're going to need three.
24	If they choose to run three feed pumps and
25	it meets the safety requirements that the plant has,

1	that gives them more redundancy in the feed system.
2	So you know, that's their choice to make that
3	modification, but they cannot increase the power level
4	until they get our approval.
5	MR. RULAND: Yeah, let's I tried to.
6	Like I said, we try to exert a certain amount of
7	mental discipline ourselves.
8	Bill, I think you want
9	MR. BIDWELL: Yes, I think we need to move
10	on to the next speaker.
11	MR. RULAND: Yes. Thank you.
12	MS. CABBAGE: Hi. I'd like to thank you
13	guys for coming tonight and having this meeting, and
14	I really look forward to other meetings.
15	My name is Pamela Cabbage. I live in
16	Putney, Vermont.
17	I have been to I don't know at least
18	a dozen meetings about the uprate. I went to a
19	meeting, as many people in this room probably did,
20	last summer hosted by a county regional commission.
21	There was some NRC representatives there. There were
22	also some Entergy people there.
23	The question of why they want an uprate
24	was specifically asked and specifically answered by
25	Entergy that they wanted to make more money. It's

1 real clear, and you guys can debate about it and think about the ethics of whether or not you should answer 2 that question, but that's the bottom line. 3 4 At that meeting there was also quite a bit 5 of discussion about power uprates because many of us in the community who are not nuclear engineers but are 6 7 concerned about our safety didn't have the expertise to understand what an uprate was. So there was a lot 8 of discussion about the NRC's process. 9 So in that I was led to believe, and I 10 11 feel like there is some misconstruing going on tonight, that there has never been, and you can 12 13 correct me if I'm wrong, an uprate application that 14 has not been processed and implemented because the NRC 15 works with the industry to make sure that the uprates are safe, and so they always have happened. 16 17 Am I wrong? 18 MR. RULAND: You're right. 19 MS. CABBAGE: Thank you. 2.0 I have more. That's all I need. 21 We have approved every MR. RULAND: 22 uprate. 23 MS. CABBAGE: That's great. Could I go 24 on? 25 MR. RULAND: Yes.

1 MS. CABBAGE: Because there a many people who would like to talk, and I think we only have about 2 3 27 more minutes. 4 I would just like to say that we in this 5 community have fears of your collusion with the industry. Whether or not they are founded, we have 6 7 really strong fears. I understand. 8 MR. RULAND: I want to finish. 9 MS. CABBAGE: 10 We also have really strong fears that this 11 company that has only been in the community for two 12 years is really being straightforward with us. There has been a lot of local press about 13 14 various things that have happened, and we don't feel 15 like they're being straightforward and aboveboard with 16 us. 17 SO all we are asking is for this 18 independent safety assessment. If there's not a 19 problem with the plant, then the uprate will happen and we'll all feel confident about it. 20 We live in 21 this community. We live in fear of Chernobyl. We 22 live in fear of not having a community anymore, and 23 it's really real for us. 24 I know that it's not your job. I know you don't want to think about meltdowns. 25 I know all of

1 that, but if you guys just hear us, we just want this assessment. We know that you're doing your job to the 2 3 best of your ability. We want a little more because 4 there's a lot of fear in our community. 5 Thank you. (Applause.) 6 7 MR. RULAND: Well, said. Thank you. I do want to keep moving 8 MR. BIDWELL: 9 around to folks. Just a time warning, which is we did 10 tell the school district that we would be out in 25 11 minutes, and that's just out of respect of their staff 12 that has to close up the room. 13 I know that there are a lot of people who 14 have questions and comments that they want to make. 15 What I would urge is that if there are specific things that would make a satisfying independent safety 16 assessment, what exactly independent means to you, 17 18 those are things that you need to communicate clearly 19 to NRC to make sure that they understand what it is 20 that you're really asking for. 21 MS. DAVIDSON: Hello. My name is Judy 22 Davidson, and I live in Dummerston within the ten mile 23 radius. 24 Okay, great. Yes, I have a lot of information here, and I'm following up on, you know, 25

I guess it's Pamela to give you some ideas about why we here in this room have a lot of mistrust of the NRC.

Basically we believe that the words mean nobody really cares because although the NRC is charged with protecting the health and safety of the public, the evidence points to the NRC being more concerned with the profits of the industry than with us. The near accident at the Davis-Besse plant in 2001 is a clear example of the NRC caving into the owners of the plant who complained it would be too costly to shut the plant down.

Finally, when the plant was shut down, it was discovered that there was a huge hole in the six inch steel reactor cap, and although the Inspector General of the NRC chastised the agency later for putting profits above the public safety and the agency set up a task force to make recommendations to prevent this kind of event again, in July of this year, the NRC promoted Stan Collins, the NRC official who was ultimately responsible for allowing the plant to stay open.

How can we, the public, believe that the NRC actually learns from its mistakes and is concerned about the public's trust in it if you promote somebody

who so blatantly favored industry profits over the public's safety?

I could go on and on and on from many, many articles that write about the ways in which the industry is really in collusion with the NRC. Whether you people yourselves do that or not, there is a real perceived perception.

In September of 2003, the Union of Concerned Scientists sent a lengthy vote of no confidence letter to the NRC, and in this letter they deplored the safety culture of the NRC as evidenced by surveys of NRC employees themselves who reported that nearly half of the NRC's work force is reluctant to raise safety concerns and a third of those who voice safety concerns feel they have been retaliated against for doing so.

How do you expect us, the public, to trust the NRC management when so many workers don't?

And the last thing I will raise is that this September the Inspector General came out with a report on the NRC's oversight of the security at nuclear power plants, and they had many criticisms and made three recommendations, including the reinstatement of mandatory force on force testing that would be surprised, not really announced at the plant

1 ahead of time as now happens. The NRC rejected these recommendations and 2 3 insisted that what they were doing was just fine. How 4 can we, the public, be reassured when the NRC reacts 5 defensively and doesn't listen even to the recommendations of the Inspector General? 6 7 accountable to no one? And I won't go through anymore, but that 8 is why the culture, that is why the atmosphere in this 9 10 room is so charged with mistrust. 11 (Applause.) 12 MR. BIDWELL: Are you ready for the next 13 person? MS. BOLLITUS: Good evening. My name is 14 15 Magdaline Bollitus. I'm from West Minsterwest, 16 Vermont. 17 There have been some people here who have 18 all they want is independent said the safetv 19 assessment. I think that should be the very least 20 We need that no matter what else that we get. 21 happens, and we need that immediately 22 But I want more. I think we deserve more. 23 I think before an uprate is considered, I think there 24 should be absolutely documented and designed plans for what is going to happen with the waste which already 25

exists, and if the uprate is approved, what to do with
all of the waste which is going to be stuffed in the
attic in two years, which is going to have to come
out.
How can you as business people even allow
a business to continue knowing that there is
absolutely no solution to what to do with what their
byproduct is, which in this case is radioactive toxic
waste?
(Applause.)
MR. BIDWELL: If you could respond
briefly.
MR. RULAND: Well, we're not business
people. The NRC makes sure that the licensee meets
their requirements. If they don't meet their
standards, they have to shut the plant down.
If the spent fuel pool is full and they
have no place to put it, they have to shut the plant
down. That's our requirements because that's
because in those circumstances we believe that the
plant is safe.
Anything more than that, then the licensee
has to shut the plant down.
The NRC has comment and processes, and
what I'd suggest you do, the NRC has what's called a

1 2.206 process. Okay? You can request the NRC to take If you need some help on what this process 2 3 entails, you could talk to Mr. Blanch; you could talk 4 to Mr. Shadis; you can call my office, and we'll 5 describe it to you. You send a letter to the NRC, and we'll 6 7 evaluate it. So we do afford the public that 8 opportunity. 9 Thank you. 10 Mr. Bidwell, where are you? 11 MR. BIDWELL: Right here. Just one quick 12 request from somebody in the audience, which is if you 13 could please as you're leaving, to pick up your signs, 14 pick up your trash, it will just help the school staff 15 after the meeting. MS. KATZ: Hi. I'm Deb Katz, K-a-t-z. 16 17 live in Yankee -- I live in Yankee Rowe? -- I live in 18 Rowe, Massachusetts. I'm with the Citizens Awareness 19 Network. 20 think certain things need to 21 clarified here. You know, the Commission has made it 22 clear that it will not require licensees to defend 23 their sites from a post 9/11 terrorist attack, and 24 this uprate, in fact, makes us far more vulnerable to

terrorism and to an accident than ever before.

They can't enlarge the size of the reactor. So what they have to do is use enriched fuel to run the reactor, and this fuel, in fact, will be hotter when they take it out. It will be hotter when it's stored in that fuel pool. It will be hotter when it's put on site in dry storage. And this, in fact, is a greater terrorist target.

Right now there are 35,000 curies of cesium in the pool suspended 70 feet up in the air. To put this in context, the Hiroshima bomb had only 2,000 curies in it, and that did more damage than any of us can ever imagine.

Vermont Yankee, in case of an accident or a terrorist attack, with this uprate would release, in fact, 34 percent more radioactivity into the environment, and what's important in this and why we do this, because you know we have really been told we're acting badly tonight, is that, you know, we are afraid, but we are also suffering.

I live in Rowe. I come from western Massachusetts. We are, in fact, surrounded by two nuclear reactors. Greenfield has statistical significance in five different cancers. In the Deerfield River valley, we have a tenfold increase in Down Syndrome, statistical significance in numerous

1 cancers. We have a high rate of handicapped children and learning disabled children. 2 3 So we're not happy. We don't feel safe 4 just with the standard operation, let alone with the 5 idea of an uprate and the potential for us being exposed to more. 6 7 I want to end on one note because the NRC's job is not just to protect the health and safety 8 9 of the community. It's to provide confidence, and what you can see tonight -- and I want you to know 10 11 because I've gone to these meetings all over the 12 northeast -- is none of us have confidence in you. 13 And you know, I don't need you to answer 14 me, but it would be good for somebody to think about 15 this because you're just not cutting it, and to create an Oprah Winfrey kind of approach to NRC public 16 17 participation is unacceptable. 18 (Applause.) 19 MR. DOYLE: Good evening, and thanks to 20 everybody for coming out, including our friends from 21 the NRC. 22 My name is James Doyle, and I'm a resident 23 Please forgive my appearance. of Putney, Vermont. I'm covered in mud because a resident of Vernon was 24 stuck in the mud out back, and I spent 45 minutes 25

trying to push her out of the mud because no matter how much the Vernon Select Board and elected officials talk down to me, she is my neighbor.

(Applause.)

MR. DOYLE: Just had to get that off of my chest because I'm sick of being called the barbarian at the gate, since I don't live in this town.

The story that I just told is relevant for one other reason. Essentially what you're seeing here in this room is the people that live in this area, the human beings who are worried that their children will be born with mutations, the human beings that are worried that if Vermont Yankee melts down they will never escape.

They are the human beings who go out and enjoy the woods, the rivers, the lakes, everything in this area that could possibly die because this uprate may not be done properly.

You have a chance to do something tonight, to make a decision that you will announce whenever you're going to make it to protect that. An independent safety review is not a loss for you. It is not something that if you grant it you will have lost some sort of status. Maybe Envy won't like you, but do you know what? Not a lot of people like Envy.

So it doesn't matter.

But if you grant this independent review, if you let an outside third party, non-NRC, non-NV party come in and look at this, if you give the public access to this regulatory oversight, then maybe, just maybe we'll start to trust you, and we'll worry a little bit less about, you know, kids born with extra heads and tress that are deforested and fish that are dying because of pollution.

You can't lose. You can only win. You said you're considering it. Please consider it in the terms of human beings and not corporate wages.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BRADEEN: Hello. I'm Harold Bradeen, spelled B-r-a-d-e-e-n. I'm the incident safety officer for the Vernon Fire Department, and I fully support the uprate based on the fact as an incident safety officer, my job is the safety of our fire fighting crew.

We go into that plant on a regular basis. We do a room-by-room analysis of the hazard and remedy for every single situation that we could be called into. We will be the first persons to enter that plant if Fire Brigade requests assistance.

1 I have no hesitation in going into that plant, working with their fire brigade and knowing my 2 3 men will be safe. I have full confidence in the 4 operation and status of the plant as it is, and I feel 5 it could easily pass whatever inspection is needed to meet the uprate. 6 7 I totally support the uprate. I feel very safe with the plant in my backyard. I live right 8 9 across the street, up the road a little ways, and I 10 want to see it continue and to prosper. 11 (Applause.) 12 MR. BIDWELL: Ι′m getting slower 13 noticeably. 14 MS. MILLER: Thank you. 15 My name is Sunny Miller. I live in Deerfield, Massachusetts, and like many of you, I will 16 17 take news back with me through our Website, 18 traprockpeace.org (phonetic). A thousand people visit 19 there daily or more. I want to thank our colleagues in the 20 21 Citizens Awareness Network and New England Coalition 22 on Nuclear Pollution for outstanding work in educating 23 us about our opportunities ahead. We need not only to 24 support them financially, but let's also support their

leadership by taking our own leadership.

I propose to you that in the days and months ahead, we may need to form something akin to that great organization, Clamshell Alliance, in which many different kinds of citizens, realtors, state representatives, mothers, bicyclists, many, many kinds of people showed their way to help change the world, educate their neighbors, and put an end to new nuclear power. Perhaps a new alliance called how about Upland, an Upland Alliance, might form with your local meetings or your constituents getting together for their teas, and to please confer by a very efficient teleconferencing call so that we can plan together, so that if the Nuclear Regulatory Commission doesn't put an end to the hazards we face, we will put an end to it together. A phone number to Network (413) 773-5188, extension 3. Thank you. Seven, seven, three in 413, Deerfield, Massachusetts, 773-5188, extension 3. MR. STEVENSON: Yes, my name is Tim I live in Athens, Vermont, and work in Stevenson. Brattleboro. The NRC process, as I understand it, largely concerns itself with the issue of safety, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

one issue that has not been raised tonight that I would like to bring to your attention and get a quick answer to, we don't have an evacuation plan in this area, an evacuation plan that the citizens believe in, an evacuation plan that follows the recommendations and guidance of the literature on nuclear evacuation plans.

We have a plan that has been prepared by the Vermont Emergency Management group that is in some kind of limbo right now. There are towns within the emergency planning zone that have rejected this plan. Many of the citizens do not believe in it, and what I would like to know is how much weight do you give to this fact that we don't have a plan that can get citizens safely out of here should there be a nuclear emergency.

MR. BIDWELL: Evacuation plan.

MR. HOLIAN: Evacuation planning is an issue at all nuclear power plants. They are required to do an exercise every two years. The NRC does evaluate those with teams of inspections that come out and assess those.

So, once again, as requirements were meant earlier, it is one of our cornerstones that you looked at under that reactor oversight process. We talked

1 about findings in security, that BY had one in security a couple of years ago, a yellow finding. 2 3 plants have had issues with emergency 4 preparedness, even under the reactor oversight 5 process. One of the plants when to what they call 6 7 multiple degraded cornerstone, which is the fourth column over, based almost primarily on emergency 8 preparedness findings. It was a plant in the Midwest. 9 10 So it is something we inspect. 11 MR. RULAND: I'd just like to add that 12 your comments are on the record, and you know, I'm not 13 the emergency planning guy. We've established a new 14 office in the Office of NRC specifically for emergency 15 planning because we know it's particularly important to the citizens, and we'll make sure we examine your 16 17 comments. 18 Go ahead. 19 MS. BURTON: Good evening. Hello. I'm 20 Nancy Burton, and I came up here this evening with my 21 father from Connecticut. 22 And we came up here to support 23 independent safety assessment and to push for a 24 nuclear free Vermont. Coming from Connecticut, we are familiar 25

1 with our own Milstone, where there were resident NRC inspectors during the period of time that somehow 2 3 Northeast Utilities lost two spent fuel rods. 4 understand they're all still looking for them. We also know that Milstone is somewhat 5 notorious for releasing radioactive radioisotopes into 6 7 the air. Well, coming up here to Vermont, and given where we are tonight, here's my question. Since we're 8 right across the street from an elementary school, I'm 9 10 assuming that the Vermont Yankee nuclear power plant 11 doesn't release radiation into the air. 12 Ouestion: is that correct? 13 I'm being facetious, of course. 14 MR. HOLIAN: I know you are. Somebody 15 else, I think, in the earlier meeting tried to get release off the Website. There was another comment. 16 17 You might not have been here then. 18 The nuclear power plants are required on an annual basis to submit on the document so that you 19 can access both waterborne and airborne releases. 20 21 There are federal limits for those, and it 22 something that we inspect as part of the baseline. 23 MR. PELTON: Dave Pelton. 24 I know you've looked at the accountability in the spent fuel pool. Would you care to address 25

that question here at Vermont -- I mean --

MR. HOLIAN: Well, accountability. She mentioned of Milstone plant that did have an issue with a fuel pin that was lost. There was an intense NRC inspection on that. A lot of early on shipments were made from spent fuel pools, and there was an NRC inspection report that talks about probable causes on that. There are other aspects that were related to the NRC did an inspection follow that to do a material accountability at all pools across the nation.

MR. PELTON: Thanks, Brian.

That's right, and to address that specific part of your question, just bear with me for a second. You know, myself and Beth, my other resident inspector, we did a fairly detailed review of the spent fuel at Vermont Yankee here, where I look at almost every day anyway, and we looked historically through the records from day one since they've put anything into that pit, and we validated that there's a record that all of the material they said is in there still is in there.

And we challenged them on a number of points to validate some areas that we didn't understand how they followed their process. We challenged them on that, and they took some action,

1	and indeed, we did validate that.
2	MS. BURTON: I just wanted
3	MR. RULAND: fully evaluated all of the
4	inventory and that everything they say is there is
5	right where it belongs, just to address that one
6	point.
7	MS. BURTON: Right. Well, I'm just
8	wondering if, in fact, you get the upgrade and there's
9	a 34 percent increase in the radiation, there's a sign
LO	over here. Maybe everybody could turn around and see
11	it at the end of the auditorium, Jim. "Don't be
L2	afraid to be active."
L3	And I'm wondering are you suggesting the
L4	children going to this school and their children learn
L5	not to be afraid to be radioactive.
L6	Thank you.
L7	MR. BIDWELL: I know that there are a lot
L8	of people still who have questions and comments. I
L9	don't know where our janitor is to find out how late
20	we can go.
21	Because a lot of people are planning on
22	leaving at 11 o'clock, okay, I'm not saying that we're
23	taking I'm not saying that we're taking no more
24	comments. What I'm saying is because people are
25	planning on leaving at 11 and T know that we're

1	getting into heavy attrition here, I wanted to give
2	Bill an opportunity to wrap up the summary of wait.
3	No, no, no. Listen. This is going to be useful for
4	you to wrap up the summary of where this
5	information is going to be, what they're going to do
6	with this information so that people so that people
7	know about it.
8	MS. SCHEIDLE: Thank you very much.
9	I'm Andrea Scheidle, Putney, Vermont.
10	I really wasn't going to come tonight. I
11	really wasn't going to come tonight, but I did, and I
12	had a couple of things that I want to say, and the
13	first two sound like jokes, but they have a deep
14	meaning.
15	We have five seasons here in Vermont, and
16	this is mud season, and there's an old story where a
17	man sitting on the porch of his house and he sees his
18	neighbor walking down the road, and the neighbor is up
19	to his neck in mud.
20	And so the guy says to his neighbor, "Fine
21	day for a walk."
22	And his neighbor says, "Walking hell. I'm
23	riding horseback."
24	(Laughter.)
25	MS. SCHEIDLE: Problems can be a lot

1 deeper than they initially appear on the surface. There's another little story that sounds 2 like a joke. A researcher is doing a project with 3 4 fleas, and he's training the fleas to jump over a And he gets the fleas, and he says, "Jump, 5 stick. fleas, jump, " and the fleas jump over the stick. 6 7 And each time the flea jumps, he takes a leg off the flea, and so he takes off one leg. "Jump, 8 flea, jump." The flea jumps over. He does this with 9 hundreds of fleas. 10 11 Only there's a problem because when he 12 gets all the legs pulled off the fleas, when he gets to the last one, the flea makes a tremendous effort, 13 14 jumps over the stick with that one leg, and then he 15 pulls the last leg off and nothing happens, and he finally publishes his results. 16 17 The results are: when all of the legs are 18 pulled off fleas, they can't hear. Science has a way of looking for specific 19 20 outcomes that are very dangerous these days. I just 21 came from New Zealand, which is a nuclear free 22 country, and I watched the endangered yellow-eyed 23 penguins coming into shore, and I watched all of the 24 little banded shell diggers walking on the beach. I grew up here. I remember when there 25

1 were butterflies by the thousands, before insecticides when the apple trees sang in the springtime for all 2 3 the insects that flocked around them. Something is 4 wrong, and we all know what it is. 5 Part of it is need; part of it is greed. We have greed. We all have, many of us, more than we 6 7 need. You guys, I know you have a charge and 8 9 it's to oversee something, and you have parameters. 10 You're here to do that. That's your charge, and you 11 have boundaries. You know, you can't just decide, oh, 12 we're going to get rid of all the nuclear energy, 13 right? Nuclear free Vermont. 14 I want a nuclear free world for 15 children and my grandchildren. I know you can't do Okay? But somewhere along the line, nuclear 16 17 energy became privatized, and so you were created to 18 oversee that. Do I understand that correctly? 19 oversee the private use of nuclear energy and what 20 happens to nuclear fuel in the country. 21 MR. RULAND: Yes, yes. 22 MS. SCHEIDLE: You were created as an 23 agency for that. 24 You are my employee. You are the employee 25 of every person in this room. You are the employee.

You are my employee via them. This is my microphone.
MR. RULAND: Under contract. He's under
contract.
MS. SCHEIDLE: Okay, and I'm not you
know, I don't want to take this away from anyone in
this room who still wants to speak, but we have to
trust you guys. You have to do something.
All over the world nature is dying because
of science while science is trying so hard to make
things live, but we're looking at the wrong things.
Please do something. Please help us to make this a
nuclear free world, not just the bombs that I used to
crawl under the desk to hide from, but those little
sticks that you're burying into the ground that are
going to be there for centuries and centuries and
centuries.
I want the butterflies back.
(Applause.)
MR. RULAND: Thank you. Very heartfelt
comments. Thank you.
It's by the way, it's 11 o'clock.
MS. PEIFFER: Hi. I'm Jeannette Peiffer
from Putney, Vermont.
And I just want to ask: has the NRC
scheduled additional inspection hours for the uprate?

1	MR. RULAND: I'm sorry. I missed that.
2	MS. PEIFFER: Has the NRC scheduled
3	additional inspection hours for the uprate?
4	MR. RULAND: Brian.
5	MR. HOLIAN: Yes. Inspection hours start
6	during the outage, just to watch some of those
7	modifications. Part of it will be continuing based on
8	the review by headquarters.
9	MR. RULAND: And we have a specific
10	inspection to do that, yes.
11	MS. PEIFFER: How many additional hours?
12	MR. RULAND: How many hours?
13	MR. HOLIAN: Well, a large portion of
14	baseline hours get, as I mentioned earlier, get
15	focused on all of the modifications. So it's a
16	yeah, that's on the individual. We have one
17	individual procedure that looks at certain mods and
18	then many baseline procedures also will look at
19	modifications.
20	MS. PEIFFER: (Speaking from an unmicked
21	location.)
22	MR. HOLIAN: There's some additional and
23	then there's some focused on routine inspections.
24	MR. BIDWELL: Can I ask for folks to leave
25	as quietly as they can for the other folks that are

Town

1 still speaking? MR. SPRITE: Hi. I'm Fred Sprite, and I'm 2 3 elective representative from the

from.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm acquainted with a lot of people who have or do work at Vermont Yankee, and this is definitely not about them. I have confidence in their abilities, and you guys seem like reasonable guys.

Brattleboro, the same district as Sarah Edwards is

I used to live in Rockville, Maryland, and I know those are kind of shark infested waters down there in the D.C. area.

I think what's obvious is that we're here aware of the politics that are behind what we each have to do in our jobs when we're in positions like you are and like they are.

There seems to be a consensus of the elected representatives in three states here that a true independent safety assessment or engineering assessment, whatever you want to call it, and to me that would mean something which is answerable to and hired by people in the states, but obviously, you know, I'm not one to decide that.

I just feel like as a wrap-up that it's very clear that, you know, the state, our national

delegations, people from Keene, people from Massachusetts have all made it very clear, and so your credibility hinges on being able to deliver that. It's not saying that you can't do a good enough job. It's saying that for the rest of us to have adequate confidence, which is a part of the equation, is that we feel safe; it's not that it -- you know, I know there was someone Ι know here who was an epidemiologist who studied Three Mile Island and the cancer results of that. It was a -- yeah, -- it was a 100-fold increase in rates of certain kinds of cancer.

She also studied some of the sites where depleted uranium was being tested, which is actually waste products from nuclear power plants that are being used for weapons in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, Kosovo, a couple of pounds of which I'm told can give, by repeated doctors, can give just about everybody on the planet cancer. And we blew up 90 tons of it in Iraq in '91.

I think because of things like this and the cancer rates in areas where those things have been tested, our confidence in our government is poor, and it's because people in political positions -- and you guys are in political positions -- have a hard time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	sticking your necks out far enough.
2	I know it's hard in my position just in
3	the minor position that I'm in. So I sympathize with
4	you, but I'm saying that the bigger picture requires
5	us to do so.
6	MR. RULAND: Thank you.
7	MR. SPRITE: And I ask you to.
8	MR. RULAND: The cancer studies around
9	TMI, there have been a number of them. They have not
10	shown, to the best of my knowledge, increased cancer
11	rates, but we're going to get you the results of that.
12	And if you could share that with us, and
13	we'll get that.
14	MR. SPRITE: And it's not only we're
15	aware of numerous studies that have been done, but it
16	has also gone through the court system. So it's not
17	just the reports that we have.
18	But it continues to come up, and we
19	continue to address that. We do have a whole section
20	at headquarters also that deals with health effects.
21	MR. RULAND: And, you know, we've got to
22	end this meeting right now. Okay?
23	MR. BIDWELL: We've been asked to go. I
24	do want to encourage everyone to submit written
25	comments. There were self-mailer written comment

	124
1	forms that were handed out earlier in the evening.
2	Bill, do you have a brief comment to end?
3	MR. RULAND: No, that's all right. Thank
4	you.
5	(Whereupon, the public meeting was
6	concluded.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	